

REFEREE'S FORM [Preview](#)

Supported Languages

English ▾

Does the paper contain new data or new ideas or both of them? *

Does the paper identify clearly these new data and ideas? *

Is the paper a thorough analysis of issue presented in the paper? *

Is the presentation clear? *

Does the author reach substantial conclusions? *

Is the length of the paper adequate? *

Is the language precise? *

Are the title and the abstract pertinent and understandable? *

Are the figures commensurate with the data given in the paper? *

Does the author give proper credit to related work and does he/she indicate clearly his/her own contribution? *

Your Recommendation to the Editor (Please indicate as appropriate) *

(Not to be resent to the author/s) • The manuscript is acceptable as it is. • The manuscript is acceptable with a few corrections (Please identify corrections as reviewer's report) • The manuscript will be acceptable after (some) revision (Please indicate your suggestions for revision as reviewer's report). • The manuscript may become acceptable after major revision and must be reviewed again. • I would be willing to review the paper again. • I would NOT be willing to review the paper again. • In case you are not willing to review the paper again, please recommend a new referee:

If you recommend revision, please write down your remarks. Below are a checklist of points you may consider as possible reasons for requiring revision of the paper: *

(Not to be resent to the author/s) 1. Indicate any errors in facts, arguments or conclusions. 2. Suggest any improvements in the presentations (e.g. clarity or brevity) or organization of the paper. 3. Indicate possible addition or deletion of some examples, figures, tables, results or references. Should any part of the text be presented as an appendix? 4. Are the abstract and the key words adequate? 5. Is the introduction understandable to a non-specialist? Does the conclusion adequately summarize the paper? 6. Should the manuscript's English be improved? 7. Do you suggest any other changes?

If you recommend rejection, please write down your remarks. Here is a list of points you may consider as possible reasons for rejection on the paper: *

(Not to be resent to the author/s) 1. If the paper is not relevant for the area of international relations, strategic studies and area studies in general; please give the major arguments for that. 2. If the paper adds nothing new to the area please note that and give the appropriate references to previously published papers. 3. Describe major errors in facts, arguments and conclusions. 4. Describe examples of incomprehensibility or bad presentation, including poor English. 5. If the paper deserves publication in some other journal, please suggest that journal.

Suggestions to Author *

Comments to Editor *

Recommendation *

- Major Revision
- Minor Revision
- Reject
- Accept