

Paper: “Division, Persecution and Rearrangement - The AKP’s Controversial Relationship with Turkish Civil Society”

Submitted: 31 January 2023

Accepted: 08 March 2023

Published: 31 March 2023

Corresponding Author: Şeref Türkmen

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n8p25](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n8p25)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Eka Kvantaliani

International Black Sea University, Tbilisi, Georgia

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Farid Samir Benavides Vanegas

Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá

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: Farid Samir Benavides Vanegas	
University/Country: Universidad de los Andes - Bogotá	
Date Manuscript Received: 14 th March 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 22 nd March 2023
Manuscript Title: Division, Persecution and Rearrangement – The AKP’s Controversial Relationship with Turkish Civil Society	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 39.02.2023	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes. It is clear and it shows the goal of the article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes, it does.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
I did not see any grammar or spelling mistake.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes, but basically because it does not use any special research method. Just an analysis of Turkish political situation.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes, but it is not an empirical analysis .	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Yes, they are.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
They seem to be comprehensive and appropriate. But I do not know the Turkish literature, so I cannot judge if the paper takes into account all the current literature on the topic.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

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: Ekaterine Kvantaliani	
University/Country: Georgia	
Date Manuscript Received: 13.03.2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 21.03.2023
Manuscript Title: Division, Persecution and Rearrangement - The AKP's Controversial Relationship with Turkish Civil Society	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	

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 corresponds to the content of the manuscript</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract is suggested to be revised as objects and methods are not presented.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Very few grammatical errors, the language of the article corresponds to academic language but is recommended to be revised for the spelling mistakes.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>There is no explanation of which research method was used by the researcher. I highly recommend to use observation, document-based research or any other (in my opinion qualitative) research tool which corresponds to the content of the article.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>The results are based on secondary data analysis as a result they might not be revised as the researcher's findings.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusion is clear but needs to be supported by the content</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references need to be revised either. For example, when the journal is numbered e.g. 28 the issue should be italic (1).</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: