

Paper: **“Web 2.0 at the Heart of Myanmar’s Turmoil”**

Submitted: 14 September 2022

Accepted: 05 November 2022

Published: 30 November 2022

Corresponding Author: David Gorombolyi

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n34p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n34p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kazimierz Albin Klosinski
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Kazimierz Kłosiński	
University/Country: The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin	
Date Manuscript Received: 26 X 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 30 X 2022
Manuscript Title: Web 2.0 at the heart of Myanmar's turmoil	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1004/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The abstract clearly present objects, methods and results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>There are not grammatical errors and spelling mistakes.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Yes, the study methods are explained clearly.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are clear and do not contain errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions are accurate and supported by the content</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Side 8, text in the parenthesis (One must to insignificance) I propose to transfer to the reference on the end of the side.

Side 9, 7 line from above, VPN undefined is.

Side 12, the title of subpoint “7.3. Conclusions” should exchange on the title of the point “**8. Conclusions**”.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: