

**Paper: “Great Power Politics in Post-Cold War Period: The Ukraine Crisis of 2014”**

**Submitted: 14 August 2021**

**Accepted: 13 September 2021**

**Published: 30 September 2021**

Corresponding Author: Vitalis Mbah Nankobe

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n33p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n33p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Abimbola Damilola Waliyullahi  
Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye Nigeria

Reviewer 3: Blinded

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

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:	
University/Country: Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye Nigeria.	
Date Manuscript Received: 17th August, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Great Power Politics in Post-Cold War Period.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0878/21	
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>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The title is clear. the author clearly demonstrates that he/she knows what he set to explore in mind.</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Evidently, the content of the article is wholesomely encapsulated in the abstract.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>I honestly can't sight any, i took my time to go through the work, over and over again.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>There is no doubt about the fact, the methods are clearly elucidated.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>There is no error in the results.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The conclusions are accurate, devoid of any irregularities.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate enough to accommodate the work.</i>	

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

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

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

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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!*

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Great Power Politics in Post-Cold War Period: The Ukraine Crisis of 2014	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0878/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: No	
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>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>

<p><i>The author states in the abstract “The Ukraine Crisis of 2014 which led to the annexation of Crimea by Russia has been the worst European issue since the end of the Cold War”.</i></p> <p><i>I would say that also Kosovo War (1998-1999) is another European issue since the end of the Cold War, also considering NATO missions.</i></p> <p><i>The author could say “one of the worst European issues” for example.</i></p>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>I recommend proofread.</i></p> <p><i>Few examples:</i></p> <p><i>4.3. "Weldes maintain that the shared language ..." the author should use "maintains"</i></p> <p><i>5.1. "In other to limit the scope of this study ..." the author shoupd use "in order to"</i></p>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Please, see general comments below</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):**

The manuscript is accurate and clearly presents the topic. The division in eight sections is proper and well organized.

The central point of the manuscript is the interplay between Russia and NATO. I have some comments that might improve such discussion:

1. The author properly states in 7.2 that "Baltic States such as Latvia and Lithuania were among the top 10 countries which increase their military spending in 2018 due to the perception of threat from Russia with totals of 24% and 18% respectively (Beswick, 2019)"

Baltic States could be somehow considered the "most European" countries of former Soviet Union. It is very important, for example, the annexation of the Baltic Countries in European Union. Perhaps, the authors could discuss a bit more the consequences for the leaderships in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania after the Ukraine crisis.

Moreover, the position of the Baltic States is very important for EU/NATO relations within Europe. The author could also comment this point.

2. When the author mentions the powerful countries, the author does not mention Germany. Germany plays a central role in the European Union and has a very strong influence on Eastern Europe countries (there is vast literature on this topic). Perhaps, the author could mention the role of Germany in relations between NATO (and EU) and Russia.

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