



**Paper: “From Integration to Resilience: Rethinking Euro-Atlanticism in the Post-Ukraine European Order”**

**Submitted: 21 November 2025**

**Accepted: 16 December 2025**

**Published: 31 December 2025**

Corresponding Author: Bekim Maksuti

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n35p25

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dejan Marolov  
European Scientific Institute, ESI

Reviewer 2: Marie Line Karam  
Lebanese University, Lebanon

# 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: Dr Marie line Karam	Email: <a href="mailto:MarieLine.karam@ndu.edu.lb">MarieLine.karam@ndu.edu.lb</a>
University/Country: NDU- ISD Paris	
Date Manuscript Received: 2/12/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 9/12/2025
Manuscript Title: <b>FROM INTEGRATION TO RESILIENCE: RETHINKING EURO-ATLANTICISM IN THE POST-UKRAINE EUROPEAN ORDER</b>	
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: 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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
-----------	---

<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The title effectively captures the paper's core thesis on the shift from Euro-Atlantic integration to resilience amid post-Ukraine changes, aligning well with the abstract, introduction, and conclusions.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The abstract outlines the research object (Euro-Atlanticism's transformation post-2022 Ukraine invasion), argumentative method (analysis of NATO/EU evolution and small states' roles), and key result (resilience as a function of internal integrity), though it could more explicitly detail empirical findings from the Western Balkans case.</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Minor grammatical issues appear, such as awkward phrasing (e.g., "have its emphasis turn" in Introduction; "for so" in Euro-Atlanticism section) and inconsistent tense usage; spelling is generally correct but proofreading would enhance the structure.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The paper employs a qualitative literature review and doctrinal analysis of strategic documents (e.g., NATO 2022 Strategic Concept, EU Strategic Compass), clearly structured across sections, though it lacks explicit methodological detail on source selection or analytical framework.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Arguments on NATO/EU shifts and Western Balkans small-state strategies (e.g., North Macedonia's role) are logically presented without factual errors, supported by references, but some claims (e.g., on resilience's "turn") rely more on assertion than granular evidence.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Conclusions accurately synthesize the paper's thesis, linking small-state resilience to Euro-Atlantic sustainability, with strong support from prior sections on institutional evolution and regional examples.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>

*The 25 references span key works on Euro-Atlanticism (e.g., Keohane 1984, NATO 2022), recent analyses (e.g., Bieber 2023), and regional studies (e.g., Maksuti 2022), providing balanced, relevant coverage without major gaps.*

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

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

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

**This is a timely, well-argued contribution to European security studies, effectively bridging theoretical literature with post-2022 geopolitical shifts via the Western Balkans lens. Strengths include clear structure, insightful small-state analysis, and relevance to ongoing NATO/EU debates. Minor revisions: (1) Polish grammar/phrasing for clarity (ex Introduction para 2; (2) Add a brief methods subsection specifying literature selection criteria; (3) Strengthen empirical depth with 1-2 quantitative indicators (e.g., defense spending data for North Macedonia). These changes would elevate it to publication-ready status.**

**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!*

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: 12.05.2025
Manuscript Title: <b>FROM INTEGRATION TO RESILIENCE: RETHINKING EURO-ATLANTICISM IN THE POST-UKRAINE EUROPEAN ORDER</b>	
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.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<p>Yes, the title is clear, focused, and corresponds well to the content of the article. It accurately reflects the central argument: the shift from Euro-Atlantic integration toward resilience in the post-Ukraine security environment.</p> <p>It can be noted, however, that the title implies a deeper analytical “rethinking” than what is fully developed in the article, since the paper remains more descriptive than conceptual. Despite that, the title remains appropriate and aligned with the main themes discussed.</p>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract clearly outlines the general objective of the article and indicates its main thematic focus. However, it does not present a methodological approach, nor does it specify concrete results or findings.</p>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The article is generally well written, with a clear and coherent academic style. I did not identify major grammatical errors or spelling mistakes that would hinder understanding.</p>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The study does not clearly explain its methods. The article lacks a methodological section and does not specify the research approach, analytical framework, or criteria for case selection. As a result, the methods are not explicitly presented, and the paper reads more as a conceptual or descriptive analysis. For stronger academic rigor, the author should briefly outline the research method and the analytical tools used.</p>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The article does not present results in the strict academic sense, as it does not conduct empirical research or systematic analysis. Instead, it offers a narrative and conceptual discussion. The arguments are coherent and logically structured, but they are not supported by clearly defined research results. Therefore, while the text contains no obvious factual errors, it cannot be said that the article presents clear, methodologically derived results.</p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	

*(Please insert your comments)*

The conclusions are generally consistent with the themes discussed in the article and accurately summarize the main narrative points. However, they are not directly grounded in clearly defined research findings, since the article does not present a distinct methodological framework or empirical results. The conclusions therefore reflect the author's overall interpretation rather than conclusions derived from a structured analysis. While coherent, they would be stronger if linked more explicitly to demonstrated evidence within the paper.

**7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.**

*(Please insert your comments)* They are appropriate for the topic and demonstrate good familiarity with the academic debate. However, the article does not always integrate these sources analytically; many references are cited descriptively rather than used to build or test an argument.

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

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

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

The article addresses a relevant and timely topic and is written in a clear and coherent academic style. The structure of the argument is logical, and the use of literature is extensive and thematically appropriate. However, for the paper to meet the standards of a research article, several substantive revisions are necessary.

First, the study lacks a clearly defined methodological section. The research question, analytical framework, and methodological approach should be explicitly stated, as the current version reads more as a conceptual or descriptive essay than a systematic scholarly analysis.

Second, the abstract does not outline methods or results. It would benefit from a clearer statement of the objectives, the approach used, and the main findings of the study.

Third, while the discussion is thematically rich, the article does not present empirical evidence or analytically derived results. Strengthening the connection between the literature, the argument, and concrete analytical findings would significantly improve the paper.

Fourth, the section on the Western Balkans, particularly the case of Macedonia, would benefit from deeper elaboration and more explicit justification for its selection as a case study. Integrating relevant data or comparative indicators would enhance the argument.

Finally, although the references are comprehensive and appropriate, they could be more analytically integrated into the argument rather than used descriptively.

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