



Paper: “From Truman to Reagan: The Evolution of U.S. Nuclear Policy in the Cold War Context”

Submitted: 29 July 2025

Accepted: 08 October 2025

Published: 31 October 2025

Corresponding Author: Maia Antidze

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n29p147

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

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

The title is clear and appropriate to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Regarding the research method, the author states that she will use a series of primary and secondary sources. In the LITERATURE REVIEW, she only lists three of them, which is too few to qualify as a REVIEW. In any case, it could be said that a few authors on the topic in question will be compared to narrow the scope of the article. Furthermore, in the RESULTS section, a fourth author (Ferrel) is mentioned, who was not mentioned in the LITERATURE REVIEW. At no point are there citations to support the assertions or to contrast interpretations between the authors.

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

There are no spelling or grammar errors, but there are sentences and paragraphs that are repeated almost verbatim. For example, see the final section describing Truman's policy or two paragraphs about the Eisenhower administration. This is not the case in the rest of the text.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

In the RESEARCH METHODS she states that "The study synthesizes primary and secondary sources to underscore pivotal moments and strategic shifts, considering both American and Soviet perspectives". At no point is the Soviet perspective analyzed and how it may have influenced that of the United States (or vice versa).

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

The body of the paper is clear and error-free but contains unnecessary repetitions.

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

In the DISCUSSION section, it is stated that "U.S. nuclear policy during the Cold War developed through distinct phases, each influenced by prevailing doctrines, technological advancements, and shifting international circumstances." There is little analysis of what these circumstances were that modified U.S. strategies and whether different authors agree in their analysis of how they could have influenced.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The REFERENCES section at the end of the article is extensive (although it could be longer). The main problem is that the corresponding citations do not appear in the body of the article.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

A central aspect of an article like the one proposed in the title is to contrast the interpretations of the different authors cited in the REFERENCES.

Furthermore, it would be necessary to compare how the Soviets reacted to US policy on atomic weapons and how, in turn, Soviet actions influenced the decisions of the US government.

Furthermore, to make the reading more engaging, it would be advisable to avoid repeating ideas already expressed previously, unless they serve to contrast that statement with what other authors have argued.

Reviewer B:

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.

No

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

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]

4

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]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It is a good article.

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

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

Yes the title is indicative of the content.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

I would avoid the term, 'scholarly' in reference to the work. lets the readers decide on that.

I would also avoid the term 'comprehensive'. The article is long enough but not comprehensive.

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

The language is mainly appropriate.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The author has used qualitative methods which is appropriate for the subject of the article.

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

Using the term 'result' implies that the author is using quantitative method while the method used is of qualitative nature. While it can be the framework that has been adapted by the institution, its use is debatable.

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

Generally fine

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

There are issues with the referencing system. In the intext referencing system the direct quotes need to be clearly identified, and easily traceable through accurate referencing.

The list of references at the end of the article need to be in alphabetical order. in their current format they are random.

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]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

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]

1

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The content of the article is argued well but there are issues with your referencing that you need to address. Make sure all the direct quotes are appropriately identified and properly referenced.
