

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-56997**

Title: *A Bibliometric Analysis of Trade Wars in the Globalization Era*

Recommendation:

Accept after minor revision.....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity	✓			
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Faheem Abdul

Reviewer's Comment

This manuscript presents a bibliometric analysis of research on trade wars within the broader context of globalization. Using data extracted from Scopus and Web of Science databases spanning 1990 to 2025, the study examines publication trends, country contributions, citation impact, keyword evolution, and thematic structures in the literature. The paper aims to map the intellectual landscape of trade war research and identify emerging directions in the field.

The topic is timely and relevant, particularly in light of increasing geopolitical tensions and the resurgence of protectionist policies in global trade. The manuscript contributes by providing a structured overview of the evolution of scholarly work on trade wars and highlighting key trends in research output, thematic focus, and geographic distribution.

Scientific Contribution and Analytical Depth

The manuscript demonstrates a solid descriptive contribution through its comprehensive bibliometric mapping. The analysis of publication trends, particularly the sharp increase in research output after 2017, effectively reflects the growing academic interest following the US–China trade conflict (Table 1, p. 5).

REVIEWER'S REPORT

The country-level analysis is another strength, showing China and the United States as dominant contributors, both in terms of publication volume and citation impact (pp. 5–7). The distinction between research productivity and citation influence is particularly insightful.

The keyword and thematic analyses provide useful insights into the evolution of research focus, especially the shift toward terms such as “impact,” “tariffs,” and country-specific studies after 2018 (pp. 8–10). The thematic map further enhances the study by categorizing research themes into motor, basic, niche, and emerging areas (p. 11).

However, while the descriptive findings are well presented, the analytical depth could be strengthened. The manuscript primarily reports patterns without sufficiently interpreting their broader implications. For instance, the discussion could more explicitly explain what these trends mean for theory development, policy research, or future directions in international trade scholarship.

Methodology and Analytical Approach

The use of bibliometric analysis with tools such as Biblioshiny and R Studio is appropriate and aligns with the study's objectives. The integration of two major databases (Scopus and Web of Science) and the removal of duplicates to obtain a final dataset of 993 articles is clearly described (p. 4).

The inclusion of PRISMA-style screening (Fig. 1) adds methodological clarity and transparency.

Nevertheless, some methodological aspects require further clarification. The manuscript would benefit from a more detailed explanation of search strategy limitations, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and potential biases arising from database selection. Additionally, the choice of keywords (primarily “trade war”) may have restricted the dataset, and this limitation should be acknowledged.

Structure, Style, and Presentation

The manuscript is generally well organized, with a logical flow from introduction and theoretical background to methodology, results, and conclusion. The use of tables and figures—such as annual production trends, country contributions, citation analysis, and thematic mapping—enhances clarity and supports the findings (pp. 5–11).

However, there are several issues related to language and presentation. Some sentences are overly long or repetitive, and there are minor grammatical inconsistencies throughout the manuscript. In certain

REVIEWER'S REPORT

sections, particularly the results and discussion, descriptive content could be streamlined to improve readability and avoid redundancy.

Additionally, formatting of tables and figures could be standardized, and some captions could be made more precise.

Title Evaluation and Suggestion

The current title is clear but somewhat broad. It may benefit from a slight refinement to better reflect the bibliometric and analytical nature of the study. A suggested revision is:

“Mapping Trade War Research in the Globalization Era: A Bibliometric Analysis (1990–2025)”

Specific Observations

The manuscript effectively demonstrates the growing complexity of trade war research, particularly the shift toward policy-oriented and impact-driven studies. However, stronger linkage between bibliometric findings and substantive economic or policy debates would enhance the paper's contribution.

The conclusion provides useful insights into future research directions, especially regarding green protectionism, supply chain restructuring, and emerging trade patterns, though these could be more directly tied to the bibliometric results.

Final Recommendation

Overall, the manuscript offers a valuable bibliometric overview of trade war research and provides useful insights into the evolution of the field. The methodological approach is appropriate, and the findings are clearly presented.

With minor revisions focusing on strengthening analytical interpretation, clarifying methodological limitations, refining language and structure, and improving presentation, the manuscript is suitable for publication.

Decision: Accepted with minor revisions.