

Review of: "The EU's Capacity for Enlargement: Does It Matter?"

Volodymyr Tokar¹

¹ Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article "The EU's Capacity for Enlargement: Does It Matter?" by Hubert Gabrisch endeavors to investigate the European Union's readiness to accept new members, particularly emphasizing the significance of the fourth Copenhagen criterion. The study clearly articulates its research inquiry, delving into the economic dynamics shaping the expansion of an integration community, its correlation with economic and political achievements, and its overall relevance.

Regarding its scholarly foundation, the article thoroughly engages with existing literature, incorporating theories of European integration and historical precedents, thereby demonstrating a sound integration with prior research in the field. The methodology employed, which entails a political-economic analysis utilizing a model representing a confederation of states, is pertinent and effectively supports the research objectives. This methodological approach proves instrumental in assessing the trade-offs between the economic advantages of size and the challenges posed by diversity within the EU context.

The study's findings are presented clearly and appear comprehensive. The article offers an extensive examination of the EU's historical enlargement and prospects for future expansion, aligning closely with the outlined research objectives. However, there is a notable concern regarding Figure 1, which illustrates the trade-off between size and heterogeneity. The absence of a proper citation for this figure raises doubts about its authenticity and reliability, which poses a significant issue in scholarly discourse.

The discussion and conclusions drawn in the article aptly reflect on the findings, asserting that the concept of enlargement capacity possesses rational underpinnings and is defensible. This conclusion resonates with the analytical content provided throughout the article. The title of the article is aptly chosen, encapsulating the primary focus and research inquiry effectively.

Regarding potential ethical considerations, while the article's content does not overtly imply unethical conduct, the lack of clarity regarding the origin of a crucial figure (Figure 1) raises substantial concerns. This issue underscores a deficiency in academic rigor concerning source attribution, which is essential in scholarly discourse.

Overall, while the article offers a thorough analysis of the EU's capacity for enlargement, concerns about the absence of a clear hypothesis, the omission of key sections such as "literature review" and "methodology", and the unverified source of a pivotal illustrative figure significantly undermine the paper's academic robustness. These shortcomings are substantive and cast doubt on the suitability of the article for publication in its current form.

