

**Paper: “Geopolitical Competition Among Great Powers and ASEAN’s Policy Preference”**

**Submitted: 20 June 2023**

**Accepted: 15 July 2023**

**Published: 31 July 2023**

Corresponding Author: Ousaphea Chea

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n19p52](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n19p52)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Tamar Kakutia  
International Black Sea University, Georgia

Reviewer 3: Jeewaka Saman Kumara  
University of Peradeniya, Sri Lanka

Reviewer 4: Sharad K. Soni  
Jawaharlal Nehru University, India

-----  
Reviewer A:  
Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

Yes I agree

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

I could not find this information in abstract.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

no

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

I understand from the content of study that it based on literature review . Also the title after introduction named literature review too.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

It is important to use one way of citation. APPA or Chicago stile. As I found in the body of paper there are used both.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusion is good, but it will be better if it answer the objects, methods and results which is

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

It is important to use one way of citation. APPA or Chicago stile. As I found in the body of paper there are used both. After using one style the references will changes automatically;

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

-----

-----  
Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

Yes, the title is clear and adequate.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The Abstract needs to be restated in order objects, methods, and results to be clear and demonstrate cohesion and coherence.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

There are a few grammatical errors and I would recommend upgrade (formal, more complex structures)

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The study methods are not evident.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The authors do have something to say but they need to make their point more evident. Furthermore, I would definitely recommend that they explain any abbreviation in the text.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The authors need to elaborate a bit further.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Yes, the list is comprehensive.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

-----

-----

Reviewer E:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

Yes

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Yes

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Yes, required to grammatical corrections

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Yes

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

Not Any

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Good

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Yes

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

Correct the grammatical errors

-----

-----  
Reviewer F:  
Recommendation: See Comments

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article as discussed and analysed by the author in the body of the text.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Although the abstract clearly presents objects and to some extent the results, it does not mention anything about the methods to be followed.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Grammatical errors and spelling mistakes have been found at many places throughout the article which requires proper editing.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The manuscript lacks study methods, it must be added as a separate section.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body of the paper has been well explained and appears to be clear in terms of analysis.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**



The conclusion appears to be accurate and supported by the content.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Although the references cannot be considered as comprehensive, it is appropriate in terms of relevant sources. In stead of in-text citation footnote method of citation has been followed which needs to be changed. The style of in-texting and references in terms of standard norms should strictly be followed.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

The manuscript demonstrates a good piece of research work on a relevant subject but needs minor revision being suggested as follows: (1) Since the abstract does not mention anything about the methods to be followed, it should be added. (2) Grammatical errors and spelling mistakes have been found at many places throughout the paper and hence, it needs to be rectified and corrected properly. (4) Since the study methods are absent in the body-text it needs to be written/included; and (5) A few sources may be added to the references for making it more comprehensive, besides changing the footnote method of citation into in-text citation. Having said that I would also suggest that the name of President Obama should be written in full when mentioning him for the first time. Also the style of in-texting and references in terms of standard norms should strictly be followed.

-----