



### Editorial Note

Bo Petersson has significantly modified and expanded his article in response to the two peer reviews (the second, more extensive peer review remains both anonymous and unpublished, in accordance with the reviewer's wishes). Indeed, if authors of submitted manuscripts expressly wish so, they can read the anonymized reviews and adapt and improve their manuscripts accordingly.

The Editorial Board normally honours such requests (as long as the adapted papers are resubmitted relatively quickly), even though such a procedure could make the published reviews as Critical Responses somewhat outdated—a dilemma which we have pointed out more than once in editorial notes in the journal's previous issues.

Thus the first peer review published here as a Critical Response may be or seem a bit outdated on some of its remarks and observations, as this review concerns an earlier version of the article in question. Nevertheless we have placed this review in order to stimulate academic debate on the pros and cons of the (present) field of area studies.

- Caspar ten Dam, Executive Editor

NB: do you have any comments on Bo Petersson's article and/or the critical response? Please send these to [info@ethnogeopolitics.org](mailto:info@ethnogeopolitics.org) or post these on [www.ethnogeopolitics.org](http://www.ethnogeopolitics.org).