

**Paper: “Five Years After Reform: Assessing the Adequacy of the Pension System in Georgia and EU Countries”**

**Submitted: 12 September 2024**

**Accepted: 17 October 2024**

**Published: 31 October 2024**

Corresponding Author: Maka Ghaniashvili

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n28p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n28p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Hamzo Khan Tagar

College Education Department Government of Sindh, Pakistan

Reviewer 2: Arlinda Ymeraj

European University of Tirana, Albania

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

its clear

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

abstract is ok

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

acceptable

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

quantitatively methods is satisfactory

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

its well

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

conclusions may be revised

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

appropriate

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

conclusion and recommendations section should be more focused and at least 15% of the paper

-----

-----

Reviewer E:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

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

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

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

The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.

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

There are no errors at all.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The study methods are explained clearly and argued well. The study methods are very pertinent to the study objective.

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

The body of the paper is very clear, well elaborated in an extremely interesting topic.

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

The conclusion is accurate and supported by the content. However, the only comment I have is that recommendations are missing. It would be extremely important to have also the suggestions of the authors regarding the solution.

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

Very comprehensive and appropriate.

*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]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*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):**

The authors have to suggest solution for the identified situation of the pension scheme in Georgia, or at least some suggestions.

-----