

**Paper: “The key role of the most recent EU regulation – the “Digital Operational Resilience Act” in the legal system, contemporary challenges, and Georgian perspectives”**

**Submitted: 19 August 2024**

**Accepted: 20 September 2024**

**Published: 30 September 2024**

Corresponding Author: Magda Ositashvili

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n26p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Meljana Bregu  
University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 2: Blinded

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

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

The title is clear but if the author agrees I would recommend The Key Role of the recent regulation - the "Digital Operational Resilience Act" in the Georgian legal system, challenges and perspectives.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract presents the objects of the paper but not the methodology used and the results so the abstract needs to be written explaining the methods and mentioning the research results.

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

Yes, the author must double-check some simple grammar mistakes.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methods are not clearly explained, the author should consider a paragraph dedicated to the research methods used throughout the paper.

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

The body of the paper is mainly clear and contains only some grammatical errors.

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

The articles lack accurate conclusions, they are too short and don't help the audience understand the importance of this particular paper. Also, the conclusions lack discussion on the importance of the author's ideas.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Yes

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*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]

3

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*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):**

-----

-----  
Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

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

The title of manuscript submitted is adequate and support its entire content, ideas and conclusions.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The Abstract of manuscript provides a concise detail on the topic involved, using the keypoints which the readers would firstly need to know about the work detailed in the current paper. It is also accompanied by certain keywords relevant for the manuscript content.

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

There are no grammatical errors or spelling mistakes in the manuscript submitted. The language is provided at an academic level.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The paper is featured by a conceptual research and presents the theoretical and practical issues of the Digital Operational Resilience Act, adopted and implemented at the European Union level. There is no a quantitative research methodology of research, but a conceptual one, based on a theoretical analysis of the topic involved.

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

The paper is a very useful instrument, containing a theoretical approach of the Digital Operational Resilience Act, provided in a multidisciplinary context, both from a legal and economic perspective. The topic of the current manuscript is a novelty in the field of European area of science. However, the author must take into account some suggestions provided below.

- at page 2: "The negotiation took place between the Council of Europe, the Commission, and the European Parliament.". The "Council of Europe" should be replaced with "Council of the European Union.
- at page 4: "How could the "Digital Operational Resilience Act" have prevented the scanda?!" - the last word need to be revised.
- at page 12: The following sentence should be revised by the author, because it is not concordant with the current time: "We should probably wait until July 2024 for the release of another part of RTS."

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

The conclusive remarks provided by the author at the end of the manuscript is provided succinct in accordance with the author's main results gathered during the research activity conducted on the current topic.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The author must revise the reference list in order to be compliant to the in-text citations.

For example:

- at page 11: (DORA-info, 2024) does not exist in the Reference list.
- at page 12: (D-o-r-a, 2024) does not exist in the Reference list.
- at page 13: (Bafin, 2024) is not provided in the Reference list.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

***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]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

The author must revise the manuscript in accordance with the below-stated suggestions.

- at page 2: "The negotiation took place between the Council of Europe, the Commission, and the European Parliament.". The "Council of Europe" should be replaced with "Council of the European Union.
- at page 4: "How could the "Digital Operational Resilience Act" have prevented the scanda?!" - the last word need to be revised.
- at page 12: The following sentence should be revised by the author, because it is not

concordant with the current time: "We should probably wait until July 2024 for the release of another part of RTS."

The same is true in the case of Reference list which should be concordant with the in-text citations.

For example:

- at page 11: (DORA-info, 2024) does not exist in the Reference list.
- at page 12: (D-o-r-a, 2024) does not exist in the Reference list.
- at page 13: (Bafin, 2024) is not provided in the Reference list.

-----