

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend 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:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 12/29/16	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 1/9/17
Manuscript Title:	
THE STRATEGY OF LITHUANIAN STATE SECURITY IN THE 21st CENTURY	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0135/16	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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 title is good, though I would recommend a slight revision: An Analysis of Lithuanian State Security in the 21st Century</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>These are currently written in the "Introduction" instead of the abstract. I would suggest copying into the abstract as well, but first revise the Object—I think the author may have misinterpreted the concept- Lithuanian statehood is Lithuania's objective—not the object of this paper. The author may mean that the objective of the study is to provide recommendations for how Lithuania can preserve its statehood. Also, some clarification is necessary for the Methods- How will the author's historical political analysis be conducted? How did the author choose the sources? What entity "approved" the documents used in the study, as referred to in the abstract? The definition provided for "strategy" comes from a dictionary/encyclopedia—I would suggest using a term developed in the field of political science.</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>There are several throughout the article. The author should ask a colleague to review the paper for these. Also, there are mixed FONTS and font SIZES in the paper- it should be consistent.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>Please see comments on point #2 This must be further developed.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>This is a good explanation of Lithuania's security situation. There is one error on Lithuania's entry into the EU and NATO- both occurred in 2004 (not 2014), the EU on May 1, and NATO on March 10. Also, I would suggest changing the style of B.Obama or V.Putin (for example) to President Barack Obama on the first mention and Obama thereafter (with the same concept applied to Putin or any others). The abstract points out betrayals from the West, but says nothing of the current security threats from the East, specifically Putin's Russia. The article makes several references toward the end regarding the US presidential election—now that the outcome is known, I would highly recommend revising those sections to reflect the current reality. This should not take very long to do.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusions are logical.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>No problems here.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please incorporate the suggestions I made on each section of the evaluation.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Although I checked the box for "minor" revisions – I would say there is a "medium" level of revision necessary for publication.

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

