



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Aligning Institutions and Industrial Strategy: A Transformation Framework for Georgia’s European Future”

Submitted: 13 June 2026

Accepted: 26 July 2026

Published: 31 July 2026

Corresponding Author: Bahman Moghimi

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n19p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Carlos Ibanez
Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, México

Reviewer 2: Liliana Fuentes Rosas
Tecnológico Nacional de México campus Tierra Blanca, Veracruz, México

Reviewer 3: Albert Green
St. Paul's Theological College, Awka, Nigeria

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

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

The title is clear and communicates the central theme (institutional and industrial alignment) and purpose (a framework for transformation). Specificity is moderate; it indicates a geographic focus and objective, but does not specify the type of approach (conceptual, empirical, normative, methodological).

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

Simplify and correct repetitions: e.g., “transparent flow and transparent governance and institutions” → “transparent governance and rule of law”.

Clarify methodological contribution: briefly indicate the number of studies in the review, key sources, or selection criteria.

Clarify quantitative or comparative results, if available (e.g., relative impacts of each scenario), or, if not, explicitly state that the findings are qualitative.

Avoid long lists in a single sentence; break them up for better readability.

Emphasize novelty: explain in one sentence what makes GIPTM-7 unique compared to previous frameworks (e.g., its scenario validation or its regulatory adaptation to the EU).

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

It has no grammatical errors

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodology is well-structured, transparent, and suitable for a conceptual and policy study. Strengths: systematic approach (review, thematic synthesis, contextualization, and scenarios), clear inclusion criteria, and use of national and international sources. Limitations are properly acknowledged.

Specific recommendations:

Add specific figures for the review process (number of articles, years covered, selection flow) to ensure replicability.

Specify the coding protocol: software/template, coders, and intercoder validation procedure.

State quality criteria for grey literature and how donor bias was mitigated.

Explain how the scenarios were constructed and validated (sources, experts consulted, workshops).

Include a methodological summary table and an appendix with the extraction matrix and coding

examples.

Briefly indicate how future empirical research could test hypotheses derived from GIPTM-7.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

The results and policy section is clear, coherent, and well-articulated: the scenarios are well-defined, the causal chains between pillars are plausible, and the practical recommendations (short, medium, and long term) connect directly with the findings. The sensitivity and stress tests correctly emphasize the central role of institutional credibility.

Specific recommendations:

Add evidence or indicators that support the claims of each scenario (sources, qualitative metrics, or comparative examples) to strengthen validity.

Report the criteria used to prioritize actions (impact vs. feasibility) and any preliminary cost/benefit assessments.

Include proposed responsible parties, timelines, and success metrics for key measures (e.g., ring-fenced window, 30-day licensing).

Include conflicting risks and trade-offs between policies (e.g., speed vs. governance) and how to mitigate them.

Add a summary table that links scenarios → affected pillars → prioritized recommendations, facilitating reading by reviewers and decision makers.

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

The conclusion effectively synthesizes findings, contributions, and future directions; the tone is consistent. Strengths include: clear integration of results, emphasis on institutional coordination, and proposals for further research.

Specific recommendations:

Shorten and condense: eliminate repetitions and combine subsections for greater conciseness.

Add specific evidence: include 1–2 sentences with key quantitative findings or illustrative examples to reinforce the connection between methods and results.

Briefly point out specific limitations (e.g., reliance on secondary sources; lack of microdata) to balance assertions.

Make policy implications more operational: propose 2–3 actionable priorities (e.g., create a long-term financing vehicle; an inter-ministerial coordination framework).

Reduce broad declarative language (“industrial development is ultimately...”) and replace it with measurable and verifiable recommendations.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The reference list is sufficient; it presents recent references relevant to the topic and includes in-text citations.

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]

4

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

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):

It is recommended to take into account the recommendations mentioned for publication.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: See Comments

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

The title is clear and appropriate for the article's content.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

Yes, that's correct.

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

In section 1.3, second paragraph, penultimate line, the word “strnegth” should be corrected.
In section 6.2, first line, the word “wvolution” should be corrected.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, they are explained correctly.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

The results are clear and error-free.

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

The conclusions are correct.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

There are two uncited references:

Becker et al., 2010

Leipprand & Flachslan, 2018.

The following references are not cited:

Beifert, A., Jintchveleishvili, T., & Gvarjaladze, V. (2025).

Coyle, D. (2021).

Erkomaishvili, G. (2023).

Jugheli, T. (2019).

Landesmann, M. A. (2025).

Schienstock, G., & Hämäläinen, T. (2001).

Takalo, T., & Toivanen, O. (2018).

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]

4

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

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):

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

sure it is clear

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

the abstract is alright, only tha the methodology was not mentioned in the abstract.

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

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

yes

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

yes

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

yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

but many citations are very obsolete, and need to be replaced, see comments

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

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 RESULTS 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]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

please the author should carefully paraphrase to reduce the ai content, and this paper is too long for an article, it should be maximum of 8000 words adn 23 pages

