

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: **“Arab countries within the WTO”**

Corresponding Author: Sana Bou Dargham

Email: sana.ad@hotmail.com

Doi: 10.19044/elj.v7no4a2

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Emilia Alaverdov
Georgian Technical University, Georgia

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Published: 30.12.2020



ELP Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: ELP 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.

ELP editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ELP out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 30.11. 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 02.11.2020
Manuscript Title: Arab countries within the WTO	
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: 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.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
------------------	--



1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>There are no study methods in the article</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>As I see the references need to be polish a bit.</i>	

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):

The paper is interesting and vital especially in the era of Islamophobia. On my mind the paper is a good quality it represents the object of the study the conclusion is clear as well. Just the references need to improve, the are few errors. Please see the Apa 6 style tutorial.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Please see above.



**EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF
ECONOMICS, LAW and POLITICS**

