

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: "The imperfect Democratic transition in Somalia"

Corresponding Author: Mohamed Omar Bincof
Email: bincof@gmail.com

Doi: 10.19044/elp.v8no4a1

Peer review:
Reviewer 1: Emilia Alaverdov

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Published: 31.12.2021



ELP Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: 09.07.2021.	Date Review Report Submitted: 09.07.2021
Manuscript Title: THE IMPERFECT DEMOCRATIC TRANSITION IN SOMALIA	
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>It is clear and corresponds to the text,</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>As I see Language is accurate.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Instead of study methods author uses theoretical frame. I thinks it is OK.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>Indeed it is.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Both of them are clear and accurate.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>I think they need to be corrected in text and in the section of references as well.</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 well prepared. I think only references need a bit of corrections.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: The paper is interesting and well prepared. I think only references need a bit of corrections.



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF
ECONOMICS, LAW and POLITICS



