

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSE_120643
Title of the Manuscript:	Great and Emerging Power: An Overview of the Eurasian Economic Union
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript holds importance for the scientific community, particularly within the fields of public policy and administration (supranational organisations and governance). This paper provides analysis of the Eurasian Economic Union's historical evolution, institutional framework, and the dynamics of its economic integration. The main contribution is related to the analysis of the sources and research done. The manuscript is clear, relevant for the field, and well-structured.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes. However, statement "Great and Emerging Power" somewhat confusing. I suggest having simple title "An Overview of the Eurasian Economic Union" adding main results of the overview – e.g. "as economic integration supranational organization" etc.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes. I suggest extension of sentence "Through this comparative lens, it elucidates how each union shapes regional dynamics and influences global economic relations." Into minimum 3-4 sentences to show results of the paper e.g. comparative analysis	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes. No suggestions for better	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Considering the full text provided, the article appears to be scientifically accurate. Follows established research methodology uses literature analysis techniques. The methodology part could be more detailed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The cited references are current and do not include an abnormal number of self-citations	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are some language grammar issues, to be edited.	
Optional/General comments	The cited references are current and do not include an abnormal number of self-citations. However, I suggest considering extending part - theoretical framework (overview) with review of academic sources regarding neofunctionalism and EAEU example. The section of conclusions should be expanded, covering the results of the comparative analysis, conclusions about the emerging power of the Union, as well as the outlines of the future scientific discussion. Some revision is needed.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Karlis Ketners
Department, University & Country	Vytautas Magnus University Agriculture Academy, Latvia