



Instructions for Reviewers

International Journal of Contemporary Security Studies



20
25

Faculty of Security Studies,
University of Belgrade



ijocss.fb@gmail.com



www.contemporarysecuritystudies.com

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY SECURITY STUDIES

Peer Review Report Form

Instructions for Reviewers

Thank you for contributing to the peer review process of the International Journal of Contemporary Security Studies (IJCSS). Your expertise and detailed assessment are essential in ensuring the publication of high-quality research.

- Confidentiality & anonymity – this journal follows a "double-blind peer review" process, meaning that neither the authors nor the reviewers know each other's identities. Please do not disclose your identity or discuss the manuscript with anyone outside the editorial team.
- Ethical responsibilities – if you detect "plagiarism, data fabrication, redundant publication, or any ethical concerns", please notify the editor immediately in the confidential comments section. Any conflicts of interest must also be disclosed.
- Objectivity & constructive feedback – reviews should be "fair, evidence-based, and free of bias". Your feedback should be professional, specific, and constructive, helping authors improve their work.
- Decision-making criteria – the evaluation should focus on "originality, methodological rigor, clarity, significance, and contribution to the field of contemporary security studies".

1. Manuscript Information

- Manuscript ID: *Insert ID*
- Title: *Insert title*
- Submission Date: *Insert date*

2. Overall Assessment

Criterion	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Applicable
Originality and contribution to the field	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Theoretical framework and literature review	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Introduction (background, relevance, research gap, clarity of objectives)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Methodology and research design (rigor, transparency, reproducibility)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Data collection & analysis (reliability, validity, appropriateness)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Results and findings (clarity, consistency, significance)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Discussion (interpretation, relation to research questions, depth of analysis)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Conclusion (summary of findings, contributions, future directions)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Practical and policy implications (if applicable)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Clarity and structure of the paper	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Relevance to the journal's scope	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ethical considerations (e.g., human subjects, conflicts of interest)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. Detailed Review and Recommendations

A. Strengths of the Paper

Provide a brief summary of the manuscript's key strengths.

B. Areas for Improvement

List specific areas that need improvement with concrete suggestions for revision.

C. Specific Recommendations for the Authors

Provide clear and actionable recommendations.

4. Decision Recommendation

- ☐ Accept
- ☐ Accept with minor revisions
- ☐ Major revisions required (resubmission needed)
- ☐ Reject

5. Language and Presentation

- ☐ English language and style are satisfactory
- ☐ Minor language and formatting improvements required
- ☐ Extensive language revision required

Additional comments on language, clarity, and readability: *Provide comments if necessary*

6. Confidential Comments to the Editor (if any)

For example, highlight ethical concerns, potential plagiarism, conflicts of interest, or serious methodological flaws.

7. Reviewer's Declaration

By submitting this review, I confirm that:

- I have no conflicts of interest with the manuscript.
- I have provided a fair and objective assessment.
- I have adhered to ethical review standards.

Editor-in-Chief

Prof. Dr. Vladimir M. Cvetković