

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: Analysis of Albanian legislation and perceptions of voters relevant to the quality of citizens representation in local government bodies

Submitted: 28 June 2022

Accepted: 16 December 2022

Published: 31 December 2022

Corresponding Author: Andon Kume

Email: andon.kume@gmail.com

Doi: 10.19044/elj.v9no4a1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nino Kharitonashvili

Reviewer 2: Enriko Ceko

Published: 31.12.2022



ELP Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: 22.07.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 23.07.2022
Manuscript Title: Analysis of Albanian legislation and perceptions of voters relevant to the quality of representation of the citizens in local government bodies	
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.	4
<i>The Title is adequate to the content of the article, also it is clear and points out the actual item of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Abstract is bit short and general. There is mentioned that it defines main problematic issues, but it would be better to mention these concrete problematic issues.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are very few grammatical errors like missing point at the end of the sentences (just two or three)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>It seems that the main method is analyze.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>Body is clear.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>There are not written all conclusions which author has done in the main part of work. It would be better if author just succinctly summarizes the main issues discussed in the main text of the article.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>yes,</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):

At the beginning of the work, the author talks broadly about democracy. He/She uses literature of the authors from different countries, so a comparative analysis would also be interesting. This would allow in the final part to assess compliance with the standards of democracy.

The arguments with which he substantiates the need for legislative changes are interesting, although He/She mainly relies on citizen surveys, so it is appropriate to indicate the source that conducted these surveys.

The conclusion is more descriptive and it would be better to reflect all the Conclusions and recommendations which is written in the main part about the problematic issue and the need of changes.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF
ECONOMICS, LAW and POLITICS



ELP Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Analysis of Albanian legislation and perceptions of voters relevant to the quality of representation of the citizens in local government bodies	
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.	4
The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
The Abstract should be a brief presentation of the (1) aims and (2) scope, (2) methods, (3) findings and (3) conclusion of the article. It should not duplicate the Introduction. The abstract is too short.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
There are not a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. Recommend checking the article with a professional.	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
The study methods are explained clearly but in a very short way.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
The body of the paper is clear but does contain not a few errors. Recommend checking the article with a professional.	



6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusions or summaries are accurate and supported by the content. Numbering them is needed.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The references are comprehensive and appropriate. Using the A.P.A. style requires checking again the way how references are presented. For example, reference No 11.	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

After receiving the new version, please, resend it to me for a double check.



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

