

Paper: “Role of Military From Counter Insurgency to Peace Building: Paradigm Shift in the Sri Lankan Nation-State’s Security”

Submitted: 22 December 2020

Accepted: 11 January 2021

Published: 31 January 2021

Corresponding Author: D.G. Rajitha Nilaksha Rukshan

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n2p99](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n2p99)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Osantha N. Thalpawila
University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka

Reviewer 2: David Pérez Jorge
University of La Laguna, Spain

Reviewer 3: RDP. Sampath Rajapakshe
University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka

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: Dr. RDP. Sampath Rajapakshe	Email:
University/Country: University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka	
Date Manuscript Received: 23 Dec 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 10 Jan 2021
Manuscript Title: Role of Military From Counter Insurgency to Peace Building: Paradigm Shift in the Sri Lankan Nation-State's Security	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0117/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

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 candidate has provided a justification to the topic through literature. The title accurately said what the study was about. The author provides a sufficiently comprehensive study of the topic. The research area is well known in post conflict peace building efforts in the Sri Lankan scenario.)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(The objective is clearly defined in the middle sentence of the objective part of the abstract. Yes, as the report of a research study, it should be written under the subheadings or one by one paragraph: objects, Methods, Results, Conclusion. The words 'objective' and 'discussion' did not appear in the abstract. On the other hand, the author does not mark clearly, objective of the research that is to analyze the role played by the military in the post-conflict peace building process. According to the full paper, that the candidate has identified his main objective, but did not appear in the abstract. The method and results also written down clearly. Result is central to the study's aims. It is acceptable.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(No grammatical mistakes)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(The candidate did not provide study methods, but he moved to expressed Clearly what is the methodology.)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Yes clear, the writer able to keep the continuity of the paper.)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(The author has summarized the key findings, outcomes, or information in the article. But need to acknowledge limitations and make recommendations for future work (where applicable)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(The references are comprehensive, but I would like to suggest that re-arrange the bibliography in using only one style.)</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): In your next work, add your research methods.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: No