



## European Journal of Economics, Law and Politics

Paper: **“The Wealth Effect in WTO Dispute Settlements: Analysing International Economic Law as a Normal Good”**

**Submitted:** 15 May 2024

**Accepted:** 18 September 2024

**Published:** 31 October 2024

Corresponding Author: Shilpa S. Raut

Email: [shilpa.samplonius@nhlstenden.com](mailto:shilpa.samplonius@nhlstenden.com)

Doi: [10.19044/elp.v11no2a1](https://doi.org/10.19044/elp.v11no2a1)

Peer review: Reviewer 1: Andrej Semenov

Reviewer 2: Nino Kharitonashvil

# ELP Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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: 29 June 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 5 July 2024
Manuscript Title: The Wealth Effect in WTO Dispute Settlements: Analyzing International Economic Law as a Normal Good	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	

## 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] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	5
<i>Yes.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	5
<i>The abstract clearly states the research aim of the paper, its approach and methods, as well as the central argument.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	
<i>As a non-native speaker, I refrain from commenting on grammar. However, the text is clear with minor issues related to punctuations and two instances - clarity (more in the comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	5

<i>Absolutely.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	4.5
<i>The structure is clear and appropriate, however, there is a minor issue with font and formatting in one part of the text (more details in the comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	5
<i>Yes.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	4.5
<i>Several references are not in the main text (see comments).</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):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

I am glad to recommend the paper for publication. However, there are minor issues with format and font (a couple of paragraphs), as well as with references (all details are in a separate document). No further round of reviews is required.

# ELP Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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: 22.07.2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 10.07.2024
Manuscript Title: <b>"The Wealth Effect in WTO Dispute Settlements: Analyzing International Economic Law as a Normal Good"</b>	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	

## 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	5
<i>Yes,</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	4
<i>yes</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	4
<i>yes</i>	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	5
<i>yes</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	5
<i>yes</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	3
<i>Needs a few support by the content</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	5
<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):**

**It is deep analyze but in conclusions is not summed everything. It would be better if author shortly showed all achievements of the article.**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**