

Paper: **“Fight Corruption the EU Membership Requirement: The Case of Albania”**

Submitted: 13 April 2023

Accepted: 11 August 2023

Published: 31 August 2023

Corresponding Author: Alesia Balliu

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n23p25](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n23p25)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Abebe Bahiru Bezabh
University of Gondar, Ethiopia

Reviewer 2: Fathi Zerari
Faculty of law and political science, Mohamed Cherif Messadia, Algeria

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

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

The title of the research needs revision. The existing title is very broad. Suggested title: "Fight Corruption the EU Membership Requirement: The Case of Albina". Or the writer can modify it by considering the main body of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract shall focus on the area of the research. However, this abstract begins with Southeast Europe. The opening sentence of every abstract must show the research's objective. Besides, it must briefly describe the method it applied and the findings. However, this article elaborates on unnecessary areas of the research. For example, the research title is about Albina while the abstract is discussing the South European countries.

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

There are grammatical errors all over the document. The article deserves a language edition. There are many sentences that are unclear.

Most importantly, it would be more convenient to use short sentences than lengthy and unclear sentences.

Proper use of abbreviation, informal approach to statement (be formal)

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

No study method at all.

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

The body of the paper has errors and arguments without data. From the very beginning to the last, there are confusing objects in the paper. What is the aim of the paper? To show the Albanian fight against corruption? How? What is corruption? Who fights? When? Unfortunately, it is difficult to capture the scope and limitations of the research. "Albania fighting corruption to be an EU member" then what?

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

Very bulky argumentation. It shall be very short and precise. It is a repetition of the other part of the paper that makes it lengthy. More importantly, the conclusion is unclear to show the stand of the writer.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Well classified. But most of the sources are old, so it is suggested to apply the latest data.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The title of the research can be modified and it needs rework all over the paper.

Reviewer F:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title is precise, concise and relevant to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The objective is well defined; however, the methods and the expected results are not well addressed.

In the abstract, the author should write "combating corruption" not "corruption" because the condition is combating corruption not corruption itself.

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

The author is advised to re-read the piece in order to correct few mistakes, such as the plural form (as in assets) or the omission of articles (such as "the").

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The author adopts a comparative method to well establish the relationship between the measures taken to fight against corruption and the achieved results. However, the author has not well explained this relationship.

The author shall reconsider the subdivision of title number 3.

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

The language and style are not bad; however, the following remarks are to be considered by the author.

In the abstract, the author should write "combating corruption" not "corruption" because the condition is combating corruption not corruption itself.

In the introduction, we would say "the rule of law". Instead of saying "persons who have exercised corruption for profit", it is better to say: "persons who are involved in corruption".

In the last line of the first page, the word "of" shall be substituted by "in".

The word 'solely' at the end of the first paragraph in page 2 is excessive; I think the word "mainly" would be more appropriate.

In the following paragraph, we would not consider a document "responsible": the author shall reformulate the sentence and determine which document he is pointing out. In the same paragraph, the word "absurd" is irrelevant and the "word" hanged" is to be changed".

In the following paragraph, the phrase "with the conduct of the EU" is ambiguous.

In page 3, the author shall add the article 'the' before the word "impact". The author shall reconsider the beginning of this sentence "When minimizing corruption becomes an integral part of public sector reform programs..." We would say "The media remain" not "the media remains".

In page 4, the author shall reconsider this phrase "the light of the EU agenda". When the author mentions an abbreviation, (s)he shall precise what it stands for. We would say "labeled as..."

In page 6, at the beginning of the last paragraph, the author shall use "provided for" instead of "disclosed". "several times" is to be substituted by "twice". In the last line, "to" is to be substituted by "on".

In page 7, in the last line of the first paragraph, the word "imposes" shall be changed by, for example, "criminalizes". In the last paragraph, we would say "edicting" or "promulgation", rather than "writing"

In page 9, under the title 3.1. , the phrase "constating of" shall be corrected with "consisting in". In the following sentence, the author shall observe parallelism: "The reform aims to establish accountability, fight corruption, increase access to justice, ensure the separation of powers and the independence of the judiciary, promote professionalism and increase efficiency."

In page 13, we would say "what was asked of them" not "what was asked for them".

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

The conclusion and the recommendations are acceptable, but I think that they should be summarized in a way that the author would not go back to the analysis phase and, rather, concentrate on the results and suggestions of her/his research.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are appropriate and relatively sufficient. However, the author is advised to ensure coherence between in-text citations and list of references (for example (2. G. Lovorka, The Underworld and Its Forces: Croatia, the Uskoks and Their Fight for Autonomy in Against the Day, Against the Grain).

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

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):
