

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: “A Study of the Two Documents that Create the Framework of the Contemporary Relations between Republic of Macedonia and Bulgaria”

Submitted: 23 December 2021

Accepted: 17 February 2022

Published: 31 March 2022

Corresponding Author: Dejan Marolov

Email: dejan.marolov@ugd.edu.mk

Doi: 10.19044/elj.v9no1a16

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Emilia Alaverdov

Published: 31.03.2022

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:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: A Study of the Two Documents that Create the Framework of the Contemporary Relations between Republic of Macedonia¹ and Bulgaria	
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:

¹ Both of this Treaties were concluded before the Prespa Agreement and the change of the name of the country by adding “North” before “Macedonia”.



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>It is.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>It clearly represents the idea.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>I cannot find any</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>There are no study methods.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>It is.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Indeed they are.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>They are comprehensive and appropriate, however there are some small mistakes to correct, such as full stops at the end, etc.</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):

Please see the section below.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Dear Editor,

The paper is very interesting and well written. I think it is worth to be published. Just there are very minor mistakes in the references. As for the study methods, since in the reviewer form there is a question about the study methods, I think it would give more scientific features if the author add a small paragraph of the curried methods.



EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF
ECONOMICS, LAW and POLITICS

