



REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: "From Live to Digital and Vice Versa - Alternative Rock Music Scene at the Balkans during the Pandemic Period of Covid-19"

Submitted: October 2022

Accepted: September 2023

Published: 31 October 2023

Corresponding Author: Julijana Papazova

Email: jzabeva@yahoo.com

Doi: 10.19044/llc.v10no2a4

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Olga Dąbrowska-

Cendrowska

Reviewer 2: Blind

Published: 31.10.2023

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: LLC 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.

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

Reviewer Name: Olga Dąbrowska-Cendrowska	Email: cendrowska@ujk.edu.pl
University/Country: Jan Kochanowski University of Kielce, Poland	
Date Manuscript Received: 31.10.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 10.11.2022
Manuscript Title: FROM LIVE TO DIGITAL AND VICE VERSA - ALTERNATIVE ROCK MUSIC SCENE AT THE BALKANS DURING THE PANDEMIC PERIOD OF COVID-19	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	

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
The title of the article is correct and clear. It correlates with the content of the article (methodology, theoretical approach and results). There is no need to change anything.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The abstract contains clearly defined objectives, selected research methods and results.	
3. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The methods are mentioned and described. The Author argues that the mix of methods used is the best approach to the research topic. In my opinion, it would be good if the Author separated the subsection with the research methodology. The structure of the article would have been consistent.	
3. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results are clear. The results are clear. The author refers to the musical events he researched in the three selected cities (Sofia, Skopje, Belgrade).	

5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusions are right. In my opinion, they result from the analysis carried out, which was properly embedded in the theoretical approach.	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
The references are correctly written. The article, including the bibliography, has been formatted carelessly.	
7. There are grammar and spelling errors.	4
The grammar used is fairly alright	

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):

Highly interesting article which I enjoyed reading. I would ask that the Author emphasize the methodological approach and format the article correctly.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

LLC Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: LLC 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.

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

Date Manuscript Received: 6 Feb 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 16 March 2023
Manuscript Title: From Live to Digital and Vice Versa - Alternative Rock Music Scene at the Balkans During the Pandemic Period of Covid-19	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No - No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes /No - You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes /No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a number rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each rating.

Questions	Rating Result [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 aims, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The results are clear and consistent with the aims.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The discussion and conclusions are accurate and supported by the content.	4

(Please insert your comments)

6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
---	---

(Please insert your comments)

7. There are grammar and spelling errors.	4
--	---

(Please insert your comments)

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 methodology of the paper is scattered it could be strengthened along with the theoretical framework*

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: can be considered after minor changes