



Paper: “Power in International Relations: Insights from Realist and Liberal Theories”

Submitted: 31 January 2025

Accepted: 02 March 2025

Published: 31 March 2025

Corresponding Author: Rawa M. Mahmood

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n8p27

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Eka Kvantaliani

International Black Sea University, Tbilisi, Georgia

Reviewer 2: Kłosiński Kazimierz

John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Ekaterine Kvantaliani	
University/Country: International Black Sea University / Georgia	
Date Manuscript Received: February 15	Date Review Report Submitted: February 21
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title is clear and corresponds to the text</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>The abstract presents objects (for understanding term ‘power’ from the different perspectives) but does not give us understanding which research methods were used for the research. The results are logic as the author intended to give us understanding about different types of power).</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>The author used academic English</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1

<i>The study methods are not presented in the research)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The results are vague. The outcome of the research is difficult to identify</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusion is vague. The outcome of the research is difficult to identify</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The references contain too much outdated articles.</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Kazimierz Kłosiński	
University/Country: The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin/Poland	
Date Manuscript Received: 22.02.2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 25.02.2025
Manuscript Title: Power in International Relations: insights from Realist and Liberal Theories	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 43.02.2025	
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
<i>Yes, the title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>Yes, the abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Side 24, 11 line from above. The text requires the editing. Between democratic states.</i>	

<i>In contras, neoliberalism has including:</i>	
1.	
<i>Bibliographic position [the references] are not well ordered alphabetically.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Yes, the study methods are explained clearly.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Yes, the results are clear and do not contain errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Yes, the conclusions are accurate and supported by the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Yes, the references are comprehensive and appropriate.</i>	
<i>Bibliographic position are not well ordered alphabetically.</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: exceptional work