

## REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: **“National Sovereignty and Globalization”**

Corresponding Author: Andrada Nour

Email: [andrada\\_nour@yahoo.com](mailto:andrada_nour@yahoo.com)

Doi: 10.19044/elj.v7no3a1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Habib Kazzi

Lebanese University, Lebanon

Published: 30.09.2020

## *ELP 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: ELP 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.

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

Reviewer Name: Habib Kazzi	Email: habib.kazzi@ul.edu.lb
University/Country: Lebanese University (Lebanon)	
Date Manuscript Received: 2/6/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 9/6/2020
Manuscript Title: National Sovereignty and the Globalization	
Manuscript Number: /	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>

Title and content are perfectly matched.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
The abstract should be given more attention. The author re-write it so as to highlight with more visibility the three key components: object, method and results.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>1</b>
Grammatical errors and spelling mistakes are numerous, including in the title and keywords of the article!!! It is also necessary to correct numerous punctuation errors. A thorough re-reading of this article is crucial, as well as the compliance with the method of presentation adopted by the ELP.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>1</b>
No relevant information with respect to the research methodology is provided neither in the introduction (absence of plan !!!) nor in subsequent developments.	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
The body of the article is rather relevant and does not contain notable contradictions or mistakes.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
Conclusion and summary are in adequacy with the content of the article. The author stressed the interaction between the doctrine of indivisibility of sovereignty and the doctrine of divided sovereignty. If until recently the issue of divided sovereignty was indisputable and unacceptable, in the current conditions of the globalization process that characterizes international relations, the situation has changed significantly, as it is imperative to adapt notions and concepts to new configurations.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
References evoked in the paper are relevant despite the absence of some notable studies carried out in this field. The author is also urged to comply with more accuracy with the ELP's method of presentation (classification of references).	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	<b>X</b>
Reject	

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The subject-matter is interesting and, as a whole, well addressed by the authors.

However, to improve the scientific quality of this contribution, the author should more prioritize the formal aspects of this article. In that regard, it is recommended to strictly comply with the method of presentation adopted by the ELP. In addition, grammatical errors and spelling mistakes must be corrected.

### **Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

