

Paper: “The Comparison Between the Hungarian and Romanian National Security Strategies”

Submitted: 24 November 2022

Accepted: 30 December 2022

Published: 31 December 2022

Corresponding Author: Csongor Balazs Veress

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n39p128](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n39p128)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kadir Caner Doğan
Gumushane University, Turkey

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Kadir Caner DOĞAN	
University/Country: Gumushane University-Turkey	
Date Manuscript Received:06.12.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 14.12.2022
Manuscript Title: The comparison between the Hungarian and Romanian National Security Strategies	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1218/22	
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 article is very theoretical and fluent. The content is also rich.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Sufficient. However, the method and purpose can be expressed in clearer sentences.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>None</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The method of the study can be explained more clearly. What does the comparison of the daily strategies of the two countries contribute to the literature?</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The conclusion part should be reviewed within the framework of the method and purpose of the study.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>This situation can be improved.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The number of books and articles in the bibliography should be increased.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It can be published after minor corrections specified in the evaluation form are made.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

It can be published after minor corrections specified in the evaluation form are made.