

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: ASEAN Collective Responsibility in Upholding Sovereignty in South China Sea Exclusive Economic Zone

Submitted: 07 July 2022

Accepted: 05 September 2022

Published: 30 September 2022

Corresponding Author: Manotar Tampubolon

Email: justitie234@gmail.com

Doi: 10.19044/elj.v9no3a1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Andrej Semenov

Published: 30.09.2022



ELP Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: ELP 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.

ELP editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ELP out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 12.07.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 23.07.2022
Manuscript Title: ASEAN Collective Responsibility in Upholding Sovereignty in South China Sea Exclusive Economic Zone	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

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>The title is adequate to the content.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The abstract serves as a solid guide to the methods and discussions.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>Overall, very good. There are few instances of incorrect punctuation/capitalisation (for example, page. 2., par. 2 - "The authors"; p.10 par. 1 - ",Second," , "Third,")</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Yes, straightforward and appropriate for the research topic.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>Yes.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusion is written in a matter that summarises the main arguments.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4.5
<i>Perhaps, the author(s) could include a lowercase letter after the year when multiple references have an identical author and publication year. For instance, Argent/ Darmawan - Argent (2021a), Argent (2021b), Argent (2021c)</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):

I suggest a minor revision – the editors alone can verify that these minor corrections have been done. The main reasons for choosing a “minor revision” is the list of reference and few punctuation mistakes. The language is academically appropriate, but acceptable to a wider audience. The paper successfully combined academic rigours with a journalist flair. I would certainly recommend the paper to international law experts and scholars interested in Asian Studies.

In future research, the authors could consider comparing “Sovereignty as Responsibility” understood in Western and non-Western academic circles (I say "future research" because it would consume too much time and space, and would take the current text to a different direction). The concept is entirely different (even opposing) in the Western scholarship from the one presented in the paper (see Etzioni “Sovereignty as Responsibility or Chertoff "Protecting Sovereignty Under International Law"). In other words, it seems to me that if the authors decide to compare the concept, they could challenge the universality of the Western interpretation.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

