

Paper: “The Positive Impact of the Family State Program on the Social Status of Large Families and the Encouragement of Birth in Georgia”

Submitted: 13 October 2023

Accepted: 05 December 2023

Published: 31 December 2023

Corresponding Author: Sophio Lazishvili

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n35p29](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n35p29)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ronald Osei Mensah

Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST), Ghana

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Robertas Pukenis

VDU Kaunas, Lithuania

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 20th November, 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 25th November, 2023
Manuscript Title: The positive impact of the family state program on the social status of large families and the encouragement of birth in Georgia	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 33..-58.10.2023	
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>
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>The title is researchable but has a lot of variables that needs to be explored extensively.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>The objects and the results are clear is clear in the abstract but the methods are fundamentally flawed by being absent from the work.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
There are a lot of grammatical errors that needs to be shapened. The work in its current state is not good for the audience of the journal.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>The study methods are fundamentally flawed.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	1
<i>The figures are labelled as Tables which are not tables in research sense. The results lack rigoristic presentation. The results are a total deviation and has no direct correlation with the topic and the focus of the study.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
<i>The work lacks conclusion. This is a major flaw. The work is entirely flawed.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>References has a lot of errors and must be redone to meet standard.</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):

The work is fundamentally flawed. Authors have not done enough justice to this topic. Methods are fundamentally flawed, results flawed, no findings, no discussion, no conclusions, no limitations for the study and no suggestions for further studies. The work is flawed and you need to reconsider working on it again for resubmission.

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: Robertas Pukenis	
University/Country: Lithuania, Kaunas, VDU	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/11/23	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/11/23
Manuscript Title: The positive impact of the family state program on the social status of large families and the encouragement of birth in Georgia	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1058/23	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Implementation of family policy for social welfare in the state of Georgia	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The summary covers the family situation in Georgia well enough, the methods to achieve a strong family and then what results are obtained in the implementation of the family support policy, which also includes international documents on family care	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
I myself am not competent to judge the level of English. It seems to be good.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The author acted very correctly, pointing out the family policy models in other countries and especially in Turkey. Maybe the author could develop a little thoughts about social doctrine from international documents. The tables highlight the family situation. After all, they indicate the guidelines on how to achieve the social well-being of the family.	
What is the influence of religion on the spiritual durability of the family?	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
There are no such doctrinal errors in facts or documents	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The conclusions could be stronger, broader, and the recommendations are excellent	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Some sources should be specified more precisely, such as interactive ones. But even there, if the source has pages, the page that supports the author's idea should be indicated. And if there are documents, there is usually a number (no.) or a paragraph.

1. Makrotrends.com Georgia Fertility Rate 1950–2023, <https://www.macrotrends.net/countries/GEO/georgia/fertility-rate>

Irwin , Approaches to Family Policies 2011. A Profile of Eight Countries, Division for social policy and development department of economic and social affairs united nations, New York, <https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/family/Publications/familypolicies.pdf>, And how to find the place of citation from this link? The author writes on page 8 (“Irwin,2011”) This aforementioned resource is paged and paragraphed

2. Republic of Turkey, Labor and social services, the General directorate of family and social services. Advanced Statistical Analyses 2018, https://www.aile.gov.tr/media/35868/taya18_ingilizce_kitap.pdf Document has 436 pages

Literally, the author dear dr *Sophio Lazishvili*

must specify the citation, so that it is easier to find the thought or fact quoted.

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	****
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I congratulate you. For small nations, your topic is very valuable. Just don't get discouraged. A few regulations, it will be OK

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 2023. nov. 20.	Date Review Report Submitted: 2023. nov. 28.
Manuscript Title: The positive impact of the family state program on the social status of large families and the encouragement of birth in Georgia	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <u>No</u>	
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: <u>Yes</u> /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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
I miss the time period that you want to study: ‘after Covid’ or ‘last 5 years’, ect.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
I think that it lacks a mention of the methodology, i.e. the survey.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
The wording is simple and comprehensible. A serious error in the number of EU member states.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
I feel it is necessary for the author of this article to go a little deeper into the analysis of the underlying methodology. As the topic is extremely exciting and has great potential.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
I think the results need to be presented even more carefully, as they are very interesting and diverse, and I also feel it necessary to indicate the questions, and even to analyze why the author considered these questions important.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
It needs better elaboration, but it's adequate.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
I would recommend the author of this article to work through this section, looking for data and authors who have written on this topic around 2020.	

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):

I think that the results of the questionnaire need to be presented even more, as they are very interesting and diverse, and I also feel it necessary to indicate the questions and even analyses why the author considered these questions important. The study and the results are very interesting. I lack a more thorough explanation of the reasons for the demographic deficit. I recommend that the author refers to more recent studies and scientific sources.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: