

Paper: **“Housing System, Challenges, and Perspectives The Case of Georgia”**

Submitted: 02 June 2023

Accepted: 16 September 2023

Published: 30 September 2023

Corresponding Author: Sophio Barnabishvili

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n26p13](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n26p13)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Camilla Buzzacchi

Milano Bicocca, Italy

Reviewer 2: Blinded

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: Camilla Buzzacchi	
University/Country: Milano Bicocca - Italy	
Date Manuscript Received: 28th July 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 1st August 2023
Manuscript Title: Housing System, Challenges, and Perspectives - The Case of Georgia	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0631/23	
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.	4

<i>Maybe the introduction of the notion of “policy”</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Maybe something is repeated</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The method is clear</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Clear results</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>I must admit I do not know the literature, but it seems to be appropriate</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: