

**Paper: “The Role of OSCE and EU Cooperation in Resolving the Russia-Ukraine Conflict”**

**Submitted: 03 March 2023**

**Accepted: 04 May 2023**

**Published: 31 May 2023**

Corresponding Author: Sara Mahilaj

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n14p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n14p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Roberto Di Maria  
University of Enna “Kore”, Italy

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: 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: Roberto Di Maria	
University/Country: University of Enna “Kore”	
Date Manuscript Received: 24 <sup>th</sup> of April 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: May the 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 2023
Manuscript Title: <b>The Role of OSCE and EU Cooperation in Resolving the Russia-Ukraine Conflict</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>0317/23</b>	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>The title clearly identifies the object of the paper.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Maybe the abstract is a little too long. But, also, clear.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Very few and minor errors.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Sufficiently clear.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Clear, within a straight-forward text.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>More than sufficiently accurate and motivated.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Adequate.</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):**

None

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

None