

Paper: “Consumer Perception of Private Label Products in Hungary”

Submitted: 26 August 2024

Accepted: 20 September 2024

Published: 30 September 2024

Corresponding Author: Miruna Amalia Nica

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n27p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ștefania Dumitrascu

Romanian Academy, Institute of Speleology "Emil Racovița", Bucharest, Romania

Reviewer 2: Ghosh Nabarun

West Texas A&M University, USA

Reviewer 2: Nicolae Cruceru

Romanian Academy, Institute of Speleology "Emil Racovița", Bucharest, Romania

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: Dr. N. Ghosh	
University/Country: USA	
Date Manuscript Received: 9.1.24	Date Review Report Submitted: 9.3.24
Manuscript Title: Recent trends in air pollution in the most important city of the Romanian Black Sea coast ✓	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 41.09.2024	
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: 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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	5
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. <i>Little more conclusive results would enrich the abstract.</i>	4
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	5
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3

<i>What method of analysis was followed to analyze the pollutants at the stations?</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>More conclusive data are required. Graphs are OK, but how did you collect and analyze the data?</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	4
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Work on Methodology. Did you collect data from the stations only? Who has analyzed them? What equipment, methods were used for the analysis?

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Yes! The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes. The abstract has a adequate structure.

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

I am not in a position to analyze the possible errors of the English language.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes. The methodology is adequate and clearly presented.

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

Yes.

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

Yes.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

yes

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

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]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I recommend the authors to expand the Discussion section with clarifications related to some methodological shortcomings of this study. I understand that the pollution data are freely available for only 6 years, but this is still a relatively short interval for analyzing trends in pollution concentrations, which represents a limitation of the study that needs to be addressed in the discussions.

Also, the identified trends do not include the estimation of statistical significance, which is understandable considering the data available for only 6 years that do not allow a determination of trend significance, through some appropriate statistical tools, such as the well-known Mann-Kendall test and the Sen's Slope estimator (statistical procedures that require data series generally for at least 10 years).

Consequently, I recommend the authors to clearly mention these limitations and encourage other future research that integrates longer data series that could be explored by more robust statistical procedures, such as the Mann-Kendall test and the Sen's Slope estimator.

Reviewer E:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Yes, the title fully covers the issue addressed in the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The summary followed by the Introduction covers the topic addressed in the article both methodologically and structurally. The database, search methods and results are well-synthesized, suggesting to the reader a desire to go through the material.

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

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study presents an approach to polluting factors, pertinent to time and space in the largest port city of Romania, and one of the most important industrial centers of the countries, to which is added the fact that the nodal point of Romanian tourism.

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

The material is well structured, suitable environmental conditions, infrastructure, polluting factors, local and nearby are presented that can represent a harmful mixture on aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems or can disrupt elements of biodiversity and clear soil pollution.

Another important observation is related to the graphical results, which seem to be made on a larger width than the page format allowed by the journal. In other words, the graphs on the right side of figures 2-6 seem to be degraded and this problem must be solved, by narrowing them in symmetry with the graphs on the left side.

Another very important observation, the numbering of the graphics in the text and in their titles is 3-7, although there is only one figure before them (Figure 1 from the study area), which means that this small error must be solved by renumbering the figures in Figs. 2-6, in their titles and in the text of the article.

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

The conclusion is well supported by analyzed statistical data showing seasonally and annually the potential trend of atmospheric pollutants. It is interesting that the authors were able to present some significant variations in air pollution as being influenced by the correctly presented potential drivers.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

In general, the references cover the theme of the works and are well represented in the article.

However, the authors should make these small improvements to the References section:

- I ask that the title of the work of Partene et al 2023 in the reference list (number 15) be written identically to the other references (so no capital letters for the title).
- Attention! the author Tiscovschi is written at number 21 with A.A. (for the first name) and for number 11 only A.; please fix it; also, I think it would be better if the title will be translated into English, in this form: 21. "Tiscovschi A.A. (2005). Climate and air pollution in Southern Dobrogea (in Romanian). University Publishing House, Bucharest, Romania."
- The WPR citation in the text is different from the W.P.R. from references!
- Population HUB – List of cities in Romania 2024, retrieved August 18, 2024, from <https://population-hub.com/en/ro/list-of-cities-in-romania-by-population.html>. From the references it is not cited in the text although I am convinced that data from this source was used.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

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):
