

Paper: “Theoretical Background of Input-Output Analysis and its Application in Albania”

Submitted: 23 May 2024

Accepted: 26 June 2024

Published: 30 June 2024

Corresponding Author: Elona Shehu

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n16p161](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n16p161)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ndirangu Ngunjiri
University of Nairobi, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Daniela Brevenikova
University of Economics, Slovakia

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Ndirangu Ngunjiri	
University/Country: University of Nairobi/Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 03/06/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/06/2024
Manuscript Title: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF INPUT-OUTPUT ANALYSIS AND ITS APPLICATION IN ALBANIA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0622/24	
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:	
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>Rating Result</i>
<i>Questions</i>	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>Clear and adequate, capitalize the title</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>The objective is not clear, few grammatical errors that require corrections</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>The paper requires to be formatted correctly</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Well explained</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>No errors</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Well supported</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Comprehensive</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 paper needs to be formatted, general spelling and grammatical errors be corrected, recommend publication.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Daniela Breveníková, Marta Matulčíková	
University/Country: University of Economics in Bratislava, Slovakia	
Date Manuscript Received: 24/06/2024	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Theoretical background of input-output analysis and its application in Albania	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 22.06.2024	
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 research paper corresponds to the content of the paper. It contains the theoretical aspect as well as the application of the topic (I-O analysis) and the destination that is described from the aspect of I-O analysis implementation.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>The abstract examines several studies on or related to IO analysis by various authors. It describes I-O as a method and refers to other methods applied in this context. It also indicates limitations of the I-O method of analysis in Albania.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are a few mistakes in punctuation. We have corrected some misprints and omissions in the Reference section (see the article enclosed.)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The authors' explanation of methods is clear; methods are described based on the sources dealing with the I-O topic.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results of calculations are presented clearly and accurately.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Authors present a suitable summary of the meaning, application and limitations of the I-O analysis. They also deal with the benefits of I-O analysis "in assessing the economic effects of individual policies but also in evaluating the cumulative impact of multiple policies" and propose to use this analysis for the assessment of long-term economic effects of individual policy changes.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The authors list relevant sources, most of which were published after the year 2,000. We have proposed some adjustments to this section of the research paper and tried to suggest suitable solutions. Misprints in the names of authors need to be corrected. Authors Lavoy, Szyrmer and Ghosh are not listed in the Reference section.</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):

We suggest to remove misprints in the Reference section. Solutions are offered in the corrected version of the paper (in attachment).

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: