

Paper: **“Addressing Terrorism in The XXI Century Case of Albania”**

Corresponding Author: Alesia Balliu

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n11p29

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dragica Vujadinović
University of Belgrade, Serbia

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Published: 30.04.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: ESJ 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.

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

Reviewer Name: Dragica Vujadinovic	
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 12.04.2020.	Date Review Report Submitted: April 16, 2020
Manuscript Title: ADDRESSING TERRORISM IN THE XXI CENTURY	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes /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 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.	4
<i>The subtitle/explanation of the title is too descriptive, maybe unnecessary</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this	5

article.	
<i>English is good, explanations are clear</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Could be more clearly conducted</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>The subchapter devoted to a consistent conceptual analysis is missing, there are clarifications of the meaning of terrorism but not really in a systemic and focused way, and not deep enough. There are my comments in the body text at a few places, which could be eventually useful for minor improvements of the paper.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Conclusion is too descriptive and below the level of the body of the paper</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your 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):

Please have a look of a few comments in the text, could be useful. Better articulated conclusion is necessary. Parts of the text devoted to conceptual analysis of terrorism are dispersed and a little bit poor, could be additionally enriched.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: