

Paper: “Guarantees of Protection of Animals and Birds in Criminal Law: A Case Study of Georgia”

Submitted: 13 November 2023

Accepted: 06 October 2024

Published: 31 October 2024

Corresponding Author: Giorgi Latsabidze

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n29p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n29p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ferenc Dávid
University of Pécs, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Favio Farinella
National University of Mar del Plata, Argentina

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

The title is clear.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is OK.

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

I found some "some space problems" in the text. You will find it with read color.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

I think the article needs a methods part. Only a few lines are enough. E.g. The author studied Georgian, French, etc. Criminal Code

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

Yes. But the author should mention the Spanish "zoophilia" law draft.

https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/E-9-2023-000756_EN.html

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

The article is interesting and useful.

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]

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]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

You will see it in the uploaded file.

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

In a basically descriptive text like the one analyzed, the title is comprehensive and complete.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

While the abstract presents the object of study, it lacks methods applied and results of the research.

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

there are no major gramatical mistakes in the article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Study methods are missing.

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

the body of the paper is clear. We did not find material or formal errors.

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

The conclusion should be enlarged and ellaborated more, taking into account what has been said along the article and even proposing a way out of the problem.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

references are short but appropriate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

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]

2

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):

Even though the subject is interesting, the article could be enriched by a legislative or action proposal that tends to resolve the problem raised. From a formal point of view, it would be appropriate for the titles and subtitles to be numbered to improve the presentation.
