

Paper: “Early States and Power in the Baltic Sea Region (8th–11th Centuries): A Comparative Study”

Submitted: 24 October 2021

Accepted: 26 November 2021

Published: 30 November 2021

Corresponding Author: Nazar Rizun

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n39p19](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n39p19)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Oleg M. Lugovyi
Odesa I.I. Mechnikov National University, Ukraine

Reviewer 2: Sharad K. Soni
Jawaharlal Nehru University, India

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: Oleg Lugovyι	
University/Country: Odesa I.I. Mechnikov National University, Ukraine	
Date Manuscript Received: November 5, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: November 14, 2021
Manuscript Title: Early States and Power in the Baltic Sea Region (8th–11th Centuries): an Attempt of Comparative Study	
ESJ 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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
The article does compare the ways of state formation to the South and to the North of the Baltic sea, so the title is adequate.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

The abstract is rather informative and presents objects, methods and ideas of the article clearly.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
The article is grammatically correct.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
Considerable part of the article is dedicated to the theoretical framework, dealing with the main methods of the research. The main concept, basic for the whole research, is chiefdom. But the proposed definition is somewhat uncertain, based on the sum of abbreviated opinions. It does not underline some of the peculiar features of typical chiefdom, role of kinship for instance. It would be more profitable to take some of the basic definition as a fundamental for the research, but to display all the main features of the chiefdom, which are possible to be tracked on the specific sources.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
In spite of the proposed uncertain definition of chiefdom, idea of its application to the investigation of emergence of early states in Baltic region is expectedly productive. So the results of the research must be considered clear and correct.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusion corresponds with the contents of the article	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
The references are sufficient enough for the declared aim of research.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation):

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Present article deals with the complicated problem of state formation. The search for the chiefdom in the early medieval Scandinavia, Polabia and Pomerania is the right direction. But in this search one must be attentive to the features of the chiefdom and to the correct use of the typology. This is the common problem for every typological approach. Applying tribal – chiefdom - complex chiefdom - state typology to the Slavonic state formation raises the question of clear distinguishing of these stages on the source material according to their narrow definitions. Ideally this presuppose not only search for the central place (that is widely approved for archeology) and the leader, once or twice mentioned in the sources, but also other signs of centralized hierarchical society with hereditary aristocracy, hierarchy of settlements, surplus production and some sort of specialization in economy, traces of external exchange of valuables and graves with valuable deposits etc. Also the retinue (*druzhyňa*) state

stage, defined by H. *Lowmiański* and applied by R. *Vatseba* exactly for early Slavic polities, must be concerned. But one article is too limited for taking all of these aspects into account and even the statement of the question is valuable.

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!

Reviewer Name: Prof. Sharad K Soni	Email:
University/Country: Jawaharlal Nehru University/India	
Date Manuscript Received: November 3, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: November 15, 2021
Manuscript Title: Early States and Power in the Baltic Sea Region (8th–11th Centuries): an Attempt of Comparative Study	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1120/21	
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>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3

<i>Although the title is clear and adequate to the content of the article as discussed in the body of the text, it can be modified.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract clearly presents objects and results but very briefly methods.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes which can be rectified in proof reading.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>The study methods are absent.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The result of the research as explained in the body of the paper appears to be clear with much error.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusion appears to be accurate and supported by the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references can be considered as comprehensive and appropriate.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper demonstrates a piece of good work with adequate research outcome. However, it needs minor revisions as follows: (1) The second part of the title should be modified like **Early States and Power in the Baltic Sea Region (8th–11th Centuries): A Comparative Study**, (2) The abstract should clearly present the methods adopted, not just what the author has written as ... uses comparative method to study both archaeological and written sources, (3) A sub-section needs to be added to clearly explain the methods adopted in the body-text, and (4) Grammatical errors and spelling mistakes should be corrected.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Although the paper is a good work of research, it needs minor revisions as suggested to the author. The revised paper will be worth publishing as it will be an excellent addition

to the existing literature on the subject beneficial to students and researchers having interest in history of the Baltic Sea Region.