

Paper: “The Importance of Surveyors and GPS Technology in Systematic Land Registration in Georgia: A Study of the Challenges and Opportunities”

Submitted: 30 May 2024

Accepted: 01 July 2024

Published: 31 July 2024

Corresponding Author: Tornike Merebashvili

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n20p32](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n20p32)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Enkeleda Oлдashi
University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 2: Ramiz Alia
“Aleksandër Moisiu” University, Durrës, Albania

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title is somewhat ambiguous and does not accurately reflect the content of the article. The article is more focused on the role of surveyors and GPS technology in systematic land registration, rather than just the land surveyor and GPS in the context of systematic land registrations. A more accurate title could be "The Importance of Surveyors and GPS Technology in Systematic Land Registration in Georgia".

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is brief and provides a good overview of the article's content. It mentions the importance of surveyors and GPS technology in systematic land registration, but does not provide a clear summary of the results. A more detailed abstract could be provided to give readers a better understanding of the article's findings.

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

There are a few minor errors in grammar and punctuation, but overall the article is well-written and easy to understand. However, there are a few instances of inconsistent verb tense and awkward sentence structure.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The article does not provide a clear explanation of the methods used in the study. It assumes that readers are familiar with the concept of systematic land registration and the role of surveyors and GPS technology. A more detailed explanation of the methods used in the study would be helpful for readers who are not familiar with these concepts.

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

The body of the paper is generally well-written and easy to understand. However, there are a few instances of unclear or confusing language, particularly in the section on measuring challenges in Georgian legal reality.

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

The conclusion is accurate and summarizes the main points made in the article. However, it does not provide a clear summary of the results or recommendations for future research.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references appears to be comprehensive and includes relevant sources cited throughout the article.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

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]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

****Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s)****

Overall, the article provides a comprehensive overview of the role of surveyors and GPS technology in systematic land registration in Georgia. The authors have done an excellent job in highlighting the importance of this process in ensuring the accuracy and reliability of land ownership records. However, there are several areas that could be improved upon to make the article more informative and engaging for readers.

Firstly, the title of the article could be more specific and accurate. As mentioned earlier, the title does not accurately reflect the content of the article, which is focused on the role of surveyors and GPS technology in systematic land registration in Georgia. A more specific title could be "The Importance of Surveyors and GPS Technology in Systematic Land Registration in Georgia: A Study of the Challenges and Opportunities".

Secondly, the abstract could be improved by providing a clearer summary of the results and findings of the study. The abstract is brief and provides a good overview of the article's content, but it does not give readers a clear understanding of what the study found and what implications it has for policymakers and practitioners.

Thirdly, there are a few minor errors in grammar and punctuation throughout the article. While these errors are not significant, they can distract from the overall flow and clarity of the writing. It would be helpful to have a professional editor review the article to identify and correct these errors.

Fourthly, the article could benefit from a clearer explanation of the methods used in the study. The authors assume that readers are familiar with the concept of systematic land registration and the role of surveyors and GPS technology, but for readers who are not familiar with these concepts, a more detailed explanation would be helpful.

Fifthly, some sections of the article could be improved by providing more concrete examples or case studies to illustrate the challenges and opportunities faced by surveyors and GPS technology in systematic land registration in Georgia. For example, the article could provide more details on how surveyors have used GPS technology to overcome challenges such as measuring complex boundaries or navigating difficult terrain.

Sixthly, the conclusion could be strengthened by providing more specific recommendations for policymakers and practitioners based on the findings of the study. The authors have identified several challenges and opportunities faced by surveyors and GPS technology in systematic land registration in Georgia, but they do not provide clear recommendations for addressing these challenges or taking advantage of these opportunities.

Lastly, it would be helpful to include a list of references at the end of the article that is comprehensive and accurate. The authors have cited several sources throughout the article, but there are a few instances where in-text citations do not match up with references in the list.

In terms of suggestions for future research, there are several areas that could be explored further. For example, the authors could conduct a more detailed analysis of the impact of systematic land registration on land ownership rights and disputes. They could also examine the role of other technologies, such as drones or satellite imagery, in improving land registration processes.

Overall, this is a well-written article that provides a comprehensive overview of an important topic. With a few revisions to address some minor errors and improve clarity, it has the potential to be an even more effective contribution to the field.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

Yes, the title fully matches the content and purpose of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract explains the object and the results concluded from the study done by the author.

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

No

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The article does not include the methodology as an issue of the paper.

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

Yes

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

The conclusion is clear and related to the purpose/objective of the paper.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references in this paper (footnotes) are accurate, including those from scientific works in this field to legal references.

There is no reference list at the end of the paper.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
