

**Paper: “Stabilization of the Turkish Economy in the Early 2000s and the Urgent Action Plan”**

**Submitted: 02 February 2023**

**Accepted: 25 April 2023**

**Published: 30 April 2023**

Corresponding Author: Seref Turkmen

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n10p64

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Hamzo Khan Tagar  
College Education Department Government of Sindh, Pakistan

Reviewer 4: Noor Alam  
Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia

# *ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023*

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!*

Date Manuscript Received: 03.02.2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 03.03.2023
Manuscript Title: Stabilization of the Turkish economy in the early 2000s and the Urgent Action Plan	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 37.02.2023	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <u>No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/ <u>No</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The title summarizes very clearly the broader topic, context and also the specific focus of the paper. The content is in line with the article.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>The abstract is very detailed summary of the article itself. Maybe it is even too detailed and too long. But it can remain this way.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>I am not a language editor. During reading the paper I could not find grammatical errors. In my opinion even the punctuations are correct according to the “rules” of “global English”.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The author states at the beginning that the paper will describe the Turkish economy’s situation in the 2000s. Having said that, it is not surprising that the paper is rather descriptive. It was the authors goal, thus the stated goal in terms of methodology are achieved. In general such descriptive papers can be interesting especially for those students and researchers who are interested in this period because it collects the information related to it thoroughly.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>See above, the goals were clear thus the results reflect them. The paper is descriptive about a topic and the Turkish economic development (looking back we can call it probably the best years) from an angle which is interesting because the successes are seem to be even bigger compared to todays problems.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>See above. The paper is logical, the structure is clear. As written it is descriptive and it could be more ambitious but it achieved what it planned.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The references are logical and are used consistently.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>x</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

In future works dare to be more ambitious and give more space for personal opinions and evaluation.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: DR HAMZO KHAN	
University/Country: Karachi Pakistan	
Date Manuscript Received: 02 March 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 09 March, 2023
Manuscript Title: Stabilization of the Turkish economy in the early 2000s and the Urgent Action Plan	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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 of course	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Decent</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Valuable abstract</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Ok</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Properly</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Appropriate</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Plz avoid reffrences in conclusion section</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Agreed</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>yes</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Please don't give ref. in conclusion section it should be your own and also avoid term AKU or GDP write full word in the future

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**