



Paper: “Georgia's Path to Europe: A Corpus-Assisted Discourse Study of Presidential and Prime-Ministerial Speeches”

Submitted: 03 October 2025

Accepted: 05 November 2025

Published: 30 November 2025

Corresponding Author: Nino Guliashvili

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n32p86

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Hector Aponte-Alequin
University of Puerto Rico, Puerto Rico

Reviewer 2: Isa Spahiu
State University of Tetova, Macedonia

Reviewer 3: Nawal Ayoub
Lebanese University, Lebanon

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: Nawal Ayoub	
University/Country: Lebanese University/ Lebanon	
Date Manuscript Received: 6/10/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 13/10/2025
Manuscript Title: Georgia's Path to Europe - A Corpus Linguistic Analysis of Speeches by President Salome Zourabichvili and Prime Minister Irakli Garibashvili	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 55.10.2025	
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. (Please insert your comments)	4
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. (Please insert your comments) The abstract includes the necessary elements, but it should be written as one block(one paragraph) and the researcher should double-check an awkward statement(highlighted in the attached copy).	4
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4

Good sentence structure; almost no grammatical errors or spelling mistakes; however, spaces between words should be adjusted (the researcher can refer to the attached copy)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments) good work</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are well-detailed with careful analysis</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusion could be more detailed instead of writing a very brief one.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>The references should be reconsidered and APA style should be followed (Please check the comments box in the attached copy: A detailed explanation is written next to the inaccurate references)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Good work that deserves to be published after the minor revision is done.

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

Clear, specific, and aligned with the content. Consider tightening the dash construction and signaling the approach more explicitly, e.g., “Georgia’s Path to Europe: A Corpus-Assisted Discourse Study of Presidential and Prime-Ministerial Speeches.” Minor polish could improve discoverability (CADS spelled out in the title/subtitle).

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

It states the object, methods (#LancsBox, Wmatrix5), and a high-level result, but is overly general and omits crucial specifics (time frame, corpus sizes, key statistics, and the main comparative finding). Recommend adding: number of speeches (69 vs. 28), total tokens, period (Mar 2022-Dec 2023), core statistics (e.g., the significant LL finding for “Georgia” vs. non-significant EU-terms), and a concrete takeaway about stance patterns.

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

The paper is understandable, but it contains numerous grammatical issues, typos, and stylistic infelicities (e.g., “analyses,” “tendences,” comma/spacing, fragments, inconsistent terminology such as “lingual” vs. “linguistic”). A language edit is needed.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The mixed-methods CADS design is appropriate and well motivated. Normalization and significance testing are noted, and the use of GraphColl/T-scores is promising. However, key replicability details are missing: window sizes, association metrics and thresholds per analysis, reference corpus for keywording (BE06) and how it was applied, treatment of translated texts, stop-list/lemmatization choices, handling of duplicates/HTML artifacts, and whether statistical tests were corrected for multiple comparisons. Please expand and systematize the pipeline description.

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

The structure is logical (intro, literature, background, methods, results, discussion, conclusion). Still, there are internal inconsistencies and formatting issues (figures/tables referenced but not fully specified; axes/units absent in some figure descriptions; a few sentence fragments). Some claims slip from descriptive (“more frequent”) into evaluative (“more effective”) without operationalization.

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

The summary aligns with the presented analyses, but several statements overreach the evidence (e.g., “positions her stances more effectively”). Rephrase to frequency/strength of markers and ensure every “significant” claim cites its test, statistic, and p-value.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Core CADS/CL sources are present, but formatting is uneven (years, punctuation, DOIs, capitalization), and one or two entries appear mismatched in year/title. The “Anonymous, Anonymous (2024)” Dataverse entry is acceptable for blinded review, but final needs proper authorship. Consider adding recent CADS applications to Eastern Europe/Georgia (if available) to support the “novelty” claim more cautiously.

*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]

2

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

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

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

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

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

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*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 topic is timely and the CADS approach is well chosen; however, the manuscript requires (i) language editing, (ii) fuller methodological transparency/replicability, and (iii) tightening of claims and figure/table presentation before it can be accepted.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

Yes, the title “Georgia's Path to Europe: A Corpus Linguistic Analysis of Speeches by President Salome Zourabichvili and Prime Minister Irakli Garibashvili” is both clear and well-aligned with the likely content of the article

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Excellent: This abstract is already well written, coherent, and appropriate for an academic article.

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

There are a few minor grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in the article you sent in three sections, but they do not significantly affect its overall clarity or academic quality.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are explained clearly

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

Overall, the body of the paper is clear, coherent, and logically structured, with well-developed arguments supported by quantitative and qualitative evidence.

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

The conclusion is accurate and well-supported by the content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is generally comprehensive and appropriate for the study:

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]

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]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper is well-structured, clear, and presents a valuable analysis of political discourse surrounding Georgia's EU accession. The methods are explained adequately, and the use of CADS and corpus tools is appropriate, though a brief clarification of corpus selection would strengthen the methodological rationale. The results are detailed and supported by tables, with the conclusion accurately reflecting the findings. Minor language issues and occasional typos are present, and reference formatting could be standardized. Overall, the study is insightful and makes a meaningful contribution, with only minor revisions needed to improve clarity and polish.
