



**Paper: “Globalization and Migrant Rights in Post-Pandemic Italy: Navigating Economic Dependency and Policy Exclusion”**

**Submitted: 25 June 2025**

**Accepted: 24 July 2025**

**Published: 31 July 2025**

Corresponding Author: Davide Nicolosi

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n20p17

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Anwar Anaid

University of Kurdistan-Hewler, Australia

Reviewer 2: Favio Farinella

National University of Mar del Plata, Argentina

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

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

The title is clear and representative of the content.

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

The abstract captures the content of the article well.

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

On the whole the language of the article is academic and appropriate.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methods are limited to qualitative analysis of the secondary studies.

No serious data is provided.

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

The body of the paper is coherent but short and limited, particularly considering several authors have contributed to the writing of the article.

the following are some suggestions for expanding and clarifying the content of the article:

-Giving an 'operational definition' of the meaning of globalization within the context of the article;

-Adding some arguments explaining why globalization tends to promote global migration

-The contradictions between the economic logic of globalization and national political and cultural response to its impact be explained in more details.

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

The conclusion is fine, but it is too long for a such a short essay.

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

References are fine.

***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]

3

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

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*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):**

See my comments on the main body of the article.

-----

-----

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

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

The title is absolutely adequate to the scope of the article.

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

The abstract is clear, simple and comprehensive of the main ideas developed in the text.

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

I personally found no grammatical mistakes.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Yes. The authors applied what they call is a desk based analysis. the bibliography is up to date and specific.

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

The authors transmit their ideas and main objectives of the article in a plain and clear way.

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

Yes it is. The conclusions exposed the main findings of the research and draw a prospective for the near future.

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

As said before, sources are up to date and related to the subject.

*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]  
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, no revision needed

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

-----