CENTRAL EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL AND SECURITY STUDIES



Peer Review Sheet

The goals of the peer review are to critically evaluate the quality of a given manuscript, highlight its strengths and weaknesses, indicate how it could be improved and help the Editorial Team of CEJISS make decision.

Hence, a good review should:

- be critical and to the point;
- be constructive and encouraging;
- be adequately detailed;
- provide clear suggestions;
- follow the perspective deployed by the Author(s). Please try to minimise this type of thinking: "If I wrote the paper, I would employ a different perspective."

Basic requirements of CEJISS on manuscripts

- Research goal explicitly defined
- Relationship *vis-à-vis* the existing literature on a given topic clearly articulated (a separate literature review section is not necessary, but it should be clear how the paper builds on the existing literature)
- Theoretical, conceptual, or methodological framework/approach explained
- The main argument and/or key conclusions explicitly stated

CEJISS accepts a wide range of contributions without favouring any particular theoretical or methodological tradition. It welcomes the following types of manuscripts:

- Analytical papers guided by a theoretical and/or methodological framework;
- Purely theoretical articles that aspire to create or rethink theories and concepts (even if they do not engage in extensive empirical analysis)
- Papers aspiring to make policy contribution (However, they need to satisfy academic criteria. In other words, they need to be academic/research articles in the first place.);
- Explorative papers if it is evident in which way they are innovative;
- Sophisticated synthetic and overview papers with added value and a recognisable degree of novelty.



1. Reviewed Manuscript

Manuscript title

2. Do you have any potential conflicts of interest that the CEJISS Editorial Team should be aware of? If yes, please specify.

- \Box yes
- 🗆 no

3. Assessment

	Novelty, contribution to the field	Academic craftsmanship (e.g. research design, methodological and empirical correctness)	Clarity and coherence of argument(s) (narrative, conclusions)
Internationally significant (comparable to major IR journals ¹)			
Limited international significance / international standards met to a limited degree			
Limited (particular, local) significance / basic academic standards met			
No or very minor significance / flawed standards			

4. Detailed Comments (only this part will be shared with Author/s)

¹ For example, journals published by International Studies Association: International Studies Review, International Studies Perspectives, Journal of Global Security Studies.

CENTRAL EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL AND SECURITY STUDIES



5. Private Comments to the CEJISS Editorial Team (optional)

6. Final Recommendation

$\hfill\square$ unconditionally accept the manuscript for publication

 \Box accept with minor revisions (\rightarrow The CEJISS Editorial Team shall check and assess final/minor revisions.) \Box major revisions required / revise and resubmit (\rightarrow Please note that depending on the quality of revisions, you may be asked to review the paper once more, or the CEJISS Editorial Team may decide to accept revisions as sufficient or reject as insufficient without a further round of external reviews.)

□ completely reject the manuscript

Reviewer

By entering my full name, I agree not to use the not-yet-published information from the manuscript for personal or professional gain.

Name:

Affiliation Email Select date

Please return in electronic form to Mr Jakub Marek: marek@cejiss.org

Metropolitan University Prague Dubecska 900/10 Prague, Czech Republic www.cejiss.org info@cejiss.org (+) 420 274 815 044