

Paper: “Mediterraneanization as a Developmental Phase of Media in Transitional Democracies: Case of Georgia”

Submitted: 14 May 2023

Accepted: 30 June 2023

Published: 31 July 2023

Corresponding Author: Ketevan Mumladze

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n20p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n20p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Giacomo Buoncompagni
University of Florence, Italy

Reviewer 2: Vladutescu Stefan
University of Craiova, Romania

Reviewer 3: Orungbeja, Babatunde
Babcock University, Nigeria

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: Stefan Vladutescu	
University/Country: University of Craiova, Romania	
Date Manuscript Received: 09.06.2023	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Mediterraneanization as a Developmental Phase of Media in Transitional Democracies: Case of Georgia	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 12.---44.05.2023	
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>The title of the manuscript is consistent with its content.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract correctly retains the objective, theme, method of investigation and research results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The name of one of the authors is misspelled ("Ketevan mumladze"). However, the manuscript uses coherent English. It wouldn't hurt a rereading of the manuscript, possibly done by a smart Englishman!</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The method used is appropriate to the topic approached.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are relevant.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusions of the manuscript are based on the investigation carried out.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
Considering the major methodological extension of the subject addressed, it is necessary to supplement the ideas of the manuscript with relevant elements from studies published in 2022 and 2023. <i>This manuscript does not touch references from 2022 and 2023.</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):

Current 12.--44.05.2023 manuscript needs two corrections:

- a) impregnating the manuscript with relevant references from 2022 and 2023,
- b) analyzing the possibility of introducing a section on future research,
- c) correcting the name of one of the authors ("Ketevan mumladze") and carefully rereading the manuscript.

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: Babatunde Orungbeja	
University/Country: Babcock University. Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: June 09, 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: June 12, 2023
Manuscript Title: Mediterraneanization as a Developmental Phase of Media in Transitional Democracies: Case of Georgia	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0544/23	
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 unambiguous. It reflects the article's content).</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(The abstract is more of an introduction with no emphasis on methods / research design deployed and results therefrom)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Punctuations can be better utilized and sentences made a bit simpler to achieve the desired effects)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The mixed methods approach was stated. However, the qualitative design was not well elucidated in juxtaposition to the quantitative.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(The results are clear)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(The contents are in synch with the summary.)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Some of the in text citations require a revision in line with the references. They also require rearrangement in line with APA standards.</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):

The abstract is more of an introduction with no emphasis on methods / research design deployed and results therefrom. It could have been structured into four paragraphs (1.Introduction. 2. Research design/Methodology. 3. Major and significant findings of the study. 4. Relevant conclusions which must arise from the research design and findings) written in the past tense, especially bearing in mind that the study had been completed by the time the abstract was written.

Simple sentences delimited into paragraphs comprising not more than 10 lines per paragraph, would be functional.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: