**Studia Securitatis Journal Review Questionnaire – Scientific Article**

Please use this questionnaire to structure your evaluation of this scientific article proposal. We would be very grateful if you would answer questions in a specific and detailed fashion, but do not hesitate to add any other comments or address issues that may not have been raised. Also, feel free to mark up the table of contents and the chapters themselves, if you like, and return them to us with your review (it is only necessary to return the proposal if you have made annotations).

This article is still in proposal form – that is, it has not yet been signed for publication. Your comments are very important to us in determining whether to publish this project and are very helpful to the author(s) in terms of getting specific recommendations for revision, where necessary.

**The Title of the Proposal**

…………………..………………………………………………………………………..…………..

**The Subject Area**

1. Given the above overview, would this article offer a useful, original or important contribution?

……………………..…………………………………………………………………………………

1. In which subject areas (e.g. security studies, global governance, international organisations, etc.) do you think this manuscript/proposal would principally appeal? Are there any secondary audiences (e.g. professional organisations) who might be interested in this article?

………………………………………..………………………………………………………………

**Proposals**

1. Please comment on the conceptual, empirical and methodological issues that form the basis for this manuscript/proposal? Are they sufficiently rigorous, developed and clear?

……………………………………..…………………………………………………………………

1. Is the material timely? What would be the article’s potential in the topic area?

………………………………………..………………………………………………………………

1. What is your opinion of the writing style and the reading level? Is it satisfactory and appropriate according with the Studia Securitatis Journal` criteria - [Instructions for Authors – Studia Securitatis Journal](https://magazines.ulbsibiu.ro/studiasecuritatis/recommendations/)? *(Please note that this proposal has not yet been copyedited, so there may still be some typographical or other minor grammatical/stylistic errors.* *Please though feel free to comment on the overall quality of the writing, especially if you believe that it is substandard).*

…………………………………..……………………………………………………………………

1. Based on the abstract and the content provided:
2. Are all the topics that should be included adequately covered? Please indicate any content or literature you feel has been omitted or covered in too much detail.

………………………………….…………………………………………………………

1. Is the material structured in the most logical and helpful way? Are there topics you feel should be relocated within the contents, or removed entirely?

…………………………………………………….………………………………………

1. Are there any sections you feel are particularly weak? Please add any recommendations you feel might improve the quality of this proposal.

…………………………………………………………………..……………………………………

**Recommendations**

1. Based on your comments above, what is your overall recommendation? Please choose one of the following (**colour mark**):
2. I strongly recommend this paper proposal for publication (it is an outstanding work);
3. I recommend publication (it is good or useful work which should be made available);
4. I recommend this scientific article for publication, but only if revisions are made.

What changes would be necessary for you to recommend publication? Is a major overhaul necessary or just some minor additions and/or revision?

…………………………………………………….………………………………………

1. I do not recommend this article proposal for publication.
2. **Please feel free to add any additional feedback not previously mentioned in this questionnaire, which will be sent to the author(s), as recommendations.**

…………………………………………………………..……………………………………………

………………………………………………………..………………………………………………

………………………………………………………..………………………………………………

………………………………………………………..………………………………………………

In the table below, please tick the cell corresponding to your rating for each of the criteria listed in the left-hand column (5 points representing the maximum rating):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Score** | | | | |
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| The novelty of the proposed theme |  |  |  |  |  |
| Correct use of bibliographic notes and bibliography |  |  |  |  |  |
| Originality-solving problems addressed |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuality and utility solutions presented |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clarity, brevity, and accuracy of the expressions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proper use of specialized language |  |  |  |  |  |
| Relevant bibliographic sources |  |  |  |  |  |

Thank you for contributing to the evaluation of a paper submitted for publication in the next issue of Studia Securitatis Journal.

In the peer-review procedure, we assure the confidentiality of the personal identity of both the evaluator and the author. More details about our peer-review rules: [Peer-review – Studia Securitatis Magazine (ulbsibiu.ro)](https://magazines.ulbsibiu.ro/studiasecuritatis/peer-review/).

Thank you respectfully,

Nicoleta Munteanu Ph.D.

Editor in chief

* Phone: +40771.589850
* E-mail: nicoleta.munteanu@ulbsibiu.ro