

**Paper: “Global and Planet Development Models: Theories, Models, Evaluation, and Vision”**

**Submitted: 23 March 2023**

**Accepted: 26 April 2023**

**Published: 30 April 2023**

Corresponding Author: Dastagiri MB

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n10p145](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n10p145)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Róbert Szűcs  
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Dishon Nyaga  
Kenyatta University, Kenya

-----  
Reviewer F:  
Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title is clear, concise and communicates what the paper is all about.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract is good well-structured and is highly organized.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

The structure and language are well utilized.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The study methods are clearly explained, The structure and approach are well utilized.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The thoughts are highly presented by the author.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The author did not include strong research implications.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The citations are well utilized, but there is need to cite most recent papers

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

I have looked at contents of this manuscript. The paper is good in relevance to the theme of the journal. The title is clear, concise and communicates what the paper is all about. The abstract is good well-structured and is highly organized. The thoughts are highly presented by the author. The structure and approach are well utilized. However, the author did not include strong research implications. This is important because readers would want to know what is new in this paper. The author should cite recent papers from 2018-2023 in order to contribute to study knowledge.

-----

-----  
Reviewer G:  
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title accurately reflects the content of the paper and clearly conveys the main topic of the article.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract is too long.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

The paper is well-written and there are only a few minor grammatical errors and spelling mistakes throughout the article.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

See above in "Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s)"

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

See above in "Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s)"

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusions are well-supported by the content of the paper and effectively summarize the key findings.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The number of sources used is limited and the work relies on a few main sources. See plagiarism test results.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

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

The article was subjected to a plagiarism check (as premium user at [www.turnitin.com](http://www.turnitin.com)). The match rate is high, 53%. I know the article is a literature review, but the rate is high. The results of the test can be found at <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Rtqk96PbwTBOE2ue580GGvRO-BbQeAjn/view?usp=sharing>

Major revision and resubmission is needed.

-----