EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute
15 YEARS

Paper: **"Europe and the Digital Enlightenment: Between Autonomy and Algorithmic Power"**

Submitted: 16 September 2025
Accepted: 04 November 2025
Published: 30 November 2025

Corresponding Author: Jozsef Zoltan Malik

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n32p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mai Thị Quý
People's Security Academy, Hanoi, Vietnam

Reviewer 2: Penelope Anastasiadou
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

Reviewer 3: Manas Kumar Sahu
Indian Institutes of Technology, India

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025*
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: Mai Thi Quy	
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 09/10/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/10/2025
Manuscript Title: **The Future of Europe, or the Fate of the Enlightenment Project: Drifting Toward Digital East?**	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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.	**5**
The title is thought-provoking and accurately reflects the central theme of the paper. It clearly signals the philosophical and geopolitical focus of the article and its engagement with the Enlightenment heritage in the digital era.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	**4**
The abstract effectively outlines the core research question, comparative philosophical framework, and central thesis. However, it could benefit from a slightly clearer articulation of the methodological approach and more explicit reference to any concrete results or conclusions drawn.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**

Overall, the language is formal, coherent, and academically appropriate. There are very few grammatical or stylistic issues, mostly minor (e.g., occasional complex phrasing). A light proofreading would enhance clarity.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**4**
The philosophical and conceptual methodology is described adequately, with references to Kant and Foucault as the main theoretical anchors. However, the methodological section could be slightly expanded to better distinguish between deductive reasoning and theoretical synthesis.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**4**
The paper does not present empirical results but offers a strong interpretive analysis. Within its philosophical scope, the conclusions are clearly derived and logically consistent.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
The conclusions are compelling and well-supported by the preceding analysis. The paper returns to its original questions and offers thoughtful reflections on autonomy and algorithmic control, consistent with the themes developed throughout.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
The references (assuming a full bibliography is provided in the original document) appear appropriate and aligned with the article's academic focus. Greater diversity in sources (e.g., more recent scholarship on digital governance or autonomy) would enhance the depth of the paper.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This is an intellectually engaging and timely article that offers a compelling philosophical reflection on the state of autonomy in the digital age, framed through a nuanced reading of Enlightenment thinkers. The comparative approach between Kant's ideal of autonomy and Foucault's notion of power adds depth and relevance, especially in the context of East–West digital dynamics.

To strengthen the article further, consider:

Slightly expanding the methodology section to clarify the analytic framework and sources.
Providing a more concrete summary of findings in both the abstract and conclusion.
Minor grammatical and stylistic editing for clarity and flow.
Overall, this is a strong and original contribution to the literature on digital modernity and political philosophy.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025*
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. PENELOPE ANASTASIADOU	
University/Country: ARISTOTLE UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI/ GREECE	
Date Manuscript Received: 08/10/2025	Date Review Report Submitted:16 /10/2025
Manuscript Title: **The Future of Europe, or the Fate of the Enlightenment Project: Drifting Toward Digital East?**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 10.10.2025	
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: YES 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.	**3**
It could be useful to evaluate that -*a more* ***simple and clear expression of the title-*** would be more attractive for the international scientific audience.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	**3**
Please state clearly the **findings** of your research. [*Digital similarities & differences between Western-Eastern Europe].* See "Author Guidelines European Scientific Journal, ESJ" [abstract] **https://eujournal.org/files/journals/1/documents/ESJ.Author.Guidelines.pdf**	

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**5**
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**5**
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**5**
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**3**
[*If possible*] author could enhance his paper with more **international -*up to date*- articles** about the topic. [*What other researchers found about the topic?*].	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It could be useful to explain briefly what [laws] acronyms GDPR & DSA are , for those who are unaware.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
Yes
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract need to be revised. The articulation of the East-West digital divide and its normative implications, which is a key contribution of the paper but only briefly mentioned in the abstract. The author need to clarify the call to action or the normative conclusion about Europe's digital future and the need for genuine critical autonomy.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
The author need to look for supporting evidence for unsupported assumption in the paper.
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]
4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.
[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

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):
