

Observation	Changes
Reviewer 1: A title that signals a theoretical/explanatory contribution and clarifies the analytic lens (e.g., foreign policy adaptation under entrenched fragmentation; energy–security nexus; strategy under dual governance).	Title changed: <i>From Stabilization to Mitigation of Risks: Italy's Foreign Policy Adaptation to A Fragmented Libya (2020–2024)</i>
Reviewer 2: I would suggest some language modifications, such as: <i>Dealing with failed States: Italy's adaptation to Lybia's fragmentation</i>	
Reviewer 1: Language is readable and mostly suitable, but scholarly tone would improve by tightening claims and replacing journalistic phrasing with analytic wording (e.g., clearer causal language, fewer rhetorical flourishes, and more precise attribution).	The article has been totally rewritten and the text has been revised to adopt a more academic style.
Reviewer 2: It should be amended by a mother tongue writer. There are some repetitions of concepts that could be eliminated.	
Reviewer 1: The “Introduction” does not clearly state research question(s), puzzle, and problem statement, nor does it specify the paper’s intended contribution to the international relations / geopolitics literature.	The introduction has been rewritten following these suggestions.
Reviewer 1: The abstract is too long, does not clearly communicate (a) the research question, (b) the theoretical/analytic contribution, (c) what “structural analysis” specifically means, and (d) the key findings. It also includes unexplained abbreviations, which is inappropriate for an abstract. Suggestions (actionable): Reduce length and use a standard structure: Background → RQ → Data/Method → Main findings → Contribution. Define terms such as “structural analysis” operationally (e.g., “a comparative analysis of mandate–tools–constraints across missions X/Y, based on official documents and secondary sources”). Explicitly state 2–3 concrete findings (not only broad claims). Remove or define all abbreviations at first mention.	The abstract has been completely rewritten, following these suggestions.
Reviewer 1: A dedicated Materials and Methods section is missing, so the reader	A dedicated ‘Materials and Methods’ section has been added.

cannot evaluate what evidence supports which claims.	
Reviewer 1: Because methods are unclear, the “Results” appear as narrative assertions rather than analytically-derived findings.	The ‘Results’ section has undergone a comprehensive revision, with its structure now being organised around analytically-derived findings.
Reviewer 1: “Discussion/Conclusion” should explicitly connect findings back to theory and specify scope conditions and limitations.	The ‘discussion’ and ‘conclusion’ sections of this research now explicitly connect empirical findings to established theoretical frameworks while systematically delineating the scope conditions and inherent limitations of the analysis.
Reviewer 1: define “strategic adaptation,” “risk governance,” “entrenched dualism,” and the energy–security nexus; specify expectations. Several core claims lack attribution. For example, the central framing that Italy faces a “dual strategic imperative” (economic/energy safeguarding + security threat mitigation) must be grounded in scholarship and/or official policy documents, not presented as authorial assertion.	All these concepts are now anchored in provided evidence. They are supported by many expert papers and UNDP evaluations.
Reviewer 1: Add a short limitations paragraph: data constraints, inferential limits, potential bias of security sources.	A limitations paragraph has been incorporated into the 'discussion' section.
Reviewer 2: A review of literature about State failure could be added.	A part about Libya as a failed State has been added in the introduction.
Reviewer 1: Citation style is not in APA format. Use of endnotes/footnotes as the primary citation mechanism is not acceptable for many journals unless explicitly allowed; the manuscript should comply with the journal’s referencing guidelines. Replace endnotes with in-text citations and a properly formatted reference list in APA style.	In my file and in that of reviewer 1, the notes were clearly visible. The reasons for reviewer 2's inability to locate them remain unclear. In any case, all notes now comply with the APA-7 format.
Reviewer 2: The footnotes are totally missing from the text. So, I cannot completely judge the article. Besides, the list of references has a mark of note ¹ before any entrance. So, it is possible that the author mixed up footnotes with bibliographic references. I don’t know.	