

# Unknown Paper

## AI Reviewer 1 - Comprehensive Review

*This reviewer provides a thorough and balanced assessment*

**\*\*Review of "EVERY NAME COUNTS TWICE": DIGITAL MEMORIALIZATION OF CIVILIAN DEATHS IN OCCUPIED PALESTINE (2008–2023)\*\***

\\\ **\*\*Step 1. Summary of the Paper\*\***

This manuscript examines the Palestine Body Count dataset (2008–2023) to analyze how digital memorialization of civilian casualties functions as a counter-narrative to institutional accounts in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Using a mixed-methods approach (descriptive statistics and thematic analysis of 36,512 records), the authors claim to demonstrate that trust in casualty data is co-constructed through transparent aggregation, narrative contextualization, and distributed verification. Key findings include: 79\

\\\ **\*\*Step 2. Evaluation Criteria\*\***

\\\\ **\*\*1. Originality / Novelty\*\*** **\*\*Score: 6/10\*\*** The application of mixed-methods to conflict casualty data is not novel, but the focus on digital memorialization as epistemic practice in the Palestinian context offers a moderately original angle. The theoretical framing (epistemic justice, moral witnessing) is well-established, and the dataset itself, while comprehensive, builds on existing open-source conflict documentation methodologies (e.g., ACLED, UCDP). The paper does not introduce new methodological innovations but applies existing frameworks to a specific, high-stakes context.

\\\\ **\*\*2. Scientific Rigor / Methodology\*\*** **\*\*Score: 5/10\*\*** - **\*\*Research Design:\*\*** The concurrent triangulation design is appropriate, but the absence of detail on sampling stratification (e.g., how "maximum variation" was operationalized) weakens reproducibility. - **\*\*Bias \ Controls:\*\*** The authors acknowledge reporting biases but do not quantitatively adjust for them (e.g., using capture-recapture models). The conflation of "NGO-verified" records as highest quality (98.7\ - **\*\*Ethical Approval:\*\*** No mention of IRB review or ethical oversight for using sensitive casualty data, though the data are public. This is a significant oversight for research involving traumatic content.

\\\\ **\*\*3. Clarity \ Presentation\*\*** **\*\*Score: 7/10\*\*** The paper is generally well-structured and clearly written, though the abstract overstates conclusions (e.g., "restoring epistemic integrity"). Figures/tables are absent—a major flaw for a data-driven paper. The integration of qualitative and

quantitative results is coherent, but the lack of visualizations undermines the impact of statistical findings (e.g., temporal patterns, demographic distributions).

\\\\ \*\*4. Reproducibility \ Transparency\*\* \*\*Score: 4/10\*\* - The Palestine Body Count dataset is cited as accessible via Kaggle, but no code for analysis, cleaning procedures, or qualitative coding frameworks is provided. - Statistical methods are described superficially (e.g., "correlation analysis" without specifying coefficients or tests). - Qualitative analysis lacks intercoder reliability metrics or a codebook, raising concerns about subjective bias.

\\\\ \*\*5. Significance \ Impact\*\* \*\*Score: 8/10\*\* The topic is critically important for humanitarian policy, human rights, and conflict studies. The paper addresses gaps in trust and epistemic justice in contested zones, with potential implications for journalism, advocacy, and transitional justice. However, impact is limited by methodological weaknesses and the absence of comparative analysis with other conflict datasets.

\\\\ \*\*6. Ethics \ Integrity\*\* \*\*Score: 6/10\*\* - No evidence of plagiarism, but the heavy reliance on secondary data without primary ethical review is concerning. - Limitations are acknowledged (e.g., reporting biases), but conflicts of interest are not explicitly disclaimed (e.g., author positioning vis-à-vis the conflict). - The framing leans toward advocacy, risking neutrality, though this is partially justified by the epistemic justice lens.

—

\\\ \*\*Step 3. Specific Suggestions for Improvement\*\*

\\\\ \*\*Major Flaws\*\* 1. \*\*Methodological Transparency:\*\* Provide full codebook for qualitative analysis, including intercoder reliability scores. Share scripts for quantitative analysis and data cleaning. 2. \*\*Bias Adjustment:\*\* Implement statistical corrections for underreporting (e.g., multiple systems estimation) to strengthen claims about casualty patterns. 3. \*\*Ethical Oversight:\*\* Address the lack of IRB approval and detail steps taken to anonymize data and handle traumatic content. 4. \*\*Visualization:\*\* Include time-series graphs, demographic pyramids, and thematic maps to support findings.

\\\\ \*\*Minor Flaws\*\* 1. \*\*Overstated Claims:\*\* Temper conclusions in the abstract (e.g., "restoring epistemic integrity" → "contributing to epistemic repair"). 2. \*\*Citation Errors:\*\* Several references (e.g., Sweet 2025, Kosokhatko 2025) appear to be unpublished or non-peer-reviewed. Replace with credible sources. 3. \*\*Structural Repetition:\*\* The discussion section redundantly reiterates theoretical frameworks; condense for clarity.

\\\\ \*\*Additional Analyses\*\* 1. Conduct a comparative analysis with official Israeli and Palestinian Health Ministry data to contextualize discrepancies. 2. Use network analysis to map source verification practices (e.g., how NGOs, media, and citizen reporters intersect). 3. Apply spatial regression to examine geographic patterns of reporting bias.

—

\\\ \*\*Step 4. Final Decision \ Justification\*\*

\*\*Overall Score: 6/10\*\* \*\*Recommendation: Reject\*\*

\*\*Justification:\*\* While the topic is timely and socially significant, the manuscript suffers from critical methodological flaws that undermine its scientific rigor. The lack of transparency in data

analysis, insufficient handling of reporting biases, and absence of ethical oversight preclude confidence in the findings. The paper's advocacy tone—while contextually understandable—further erodes its neutrality. For a high-impact journal, the work must demonstrate stronger empirical foundations, reproducibility, and ethical compliance. In its current form, it reads more as an extended commentary than a rigorous mixed-methods study. I encourage resubmission after major revisions, particularly to address methodological and ethical concerns.

---

## AI Reviewer 2 - Critical Review

*This reviewer provides critical analysis and identifies potential weaknesses*

### **\*\*REVIEWER 2 ASSESSMENT\*\***

#### **\*\*1. Overall Impression\*\***

My immediate reaction is one of significant methodological concern. While the topic of digital memorialization in conflict zones is undoubtedly important, this manuscript presents as an overhyped study that fails to meet the rigorous standards expected for a Tier-1 venue. The paper attempts to bridge quantitative and qualitative approaches but executes both superficially. The abstract's claim of "restoring epistemic integrity" appears dramatically overstated given the methodological limitations. The study feels more like a descriptive case study than a substantive contribution to methodology or theory.

#### **\*\*2. Technical \ Scientific Assessment\*\***

**\*\*A. Problem Definition: 2/5\*\*** - The research question is clearly motivated but lacks specificity about what constitutes "digital memorialization" beyond data aggregation. - The argument for why this problem matters relies heavily on established literature about contested narratives in conflict zones without adding novel theoretical framing.

**\*\*B. Methodological Soundness: 1/5\*\*** - Critical flaw: The study treats the Palestine Body Count dataset as authoritative without adequately addressing its inherent biases or verification limitations. - No discussion of potential selection bias in which deaths are recorded or how "civilian" status is determined. - The mixed-methods approach appears more like parallel reporting than true integration. - Hidden assumption: That digital records inherently serve memorialization functions rather than merely being data aggregation.

**\*\*C. Results \ Evidence: 1/5\*\*** - The quantitative findings (79\ - No comparison with official Israeli or Palestinian Authority statistics to establish the dataset's relative accuracy. - The qualitative analysis of 36,512 records appears superficial for thematic analysis - the description suggests coding was applied rather than emerging from deep engagement with narratives. - Claims about "trust-building" and "epistemic repair" are not supported by evidence about how different audiences actually perceive or use this data.

**\*\*D. Contribution to the Field: 2/5\*\*** - The application of mixed methods to conflict data is not novel (cited references already establish this approach). - The specific findings about Palestinian digital memorialization may have regional significance but limited generalizability. - The theoretical framework (epistemic justice, moral witnessing) is applied rather mechanically without extending these concepts.

**\*\*E. Writing \ Presentation: 3/5\*\*** - The paper is generally well-organized and readable. - However, the abstract and introduction overstate contributions, and key methodological details are insufficiently explained. - The reference to "AI-Scholar Generated Preprint" raises questions about authorship and originality.

**\*\*F. Ethical \ Transparency Standards: 2/5\*\*** - No mention of IRB approval for working with sensitive casualty data. - The dataset is cited as publicly available, but the analysis code is not provided. - Ethical concerns about treating traumatic death records as data points without deeper

engagement with ethical frameworks for such research.

### **\*\*3. Strengths\*\***

- Addresses an important and timely topic regarding conflict documentation. - Attempts to bridge quantitative and qualitative approaches, which is methodologically ambitious. - Comprehensive literature review covering relevant domains.

### **\*\*4. Weaknesses\*\***

**\*\*Major Flaws:\*\*** - Fundamental methodological weakness: Treats a single contested dataset as authoritative without adequate critical examination of its limitations. - No validation of the dataset against other sources or discussion of its methodological constraints. - Overstated claims about "epistemic repair" and "trust-building" without evidence that these effects actually occur. - Superficial integration of quantitative and qualitative methods. - Lack of comparative perspective with other conflict documentation initiatives.

**\*\*Minor Flaws:\*\*** - Inconsistent citation format (some references lack full details). - Vague descriptions of qualitative coding procedures. - Overuse of theoretical jargon without sufficient operationalization.

### **\*\*5. Recommendations for Improvement\*\***

**\*\*Required for Resubmission:\*\*** 1. Critical assessment of the Palestine Body Count dataset's limitations, biases, and verification procedures. 2. Comparison with at least one alternative data source to establish relative accuracy. 3. Evidence that digital memorialization actually functions as claimed (e.g., user engagement data, reception studies). 4. Deeper methodological explanation of how qualitative themes were derived from the data. 5. Substantial toning down of claims about "epistemic repair" and "trust-building" unless supported by direct evidence.

**\*\*Would Strengthen Future Submission:\*\*** - Primary data collection about how different audiences actually use and interpret this data. - Longitudinal analysis of how documentation practices have evolved. - More sophisticated statistical analysis beyond descriptive statistics. - Engagement with literature on digital archives and memory studies beyond the cited sources.

### **\*\*6. Verdict\*\***

**\*\*Overall Score: 2/5 - Weak Reject\*\***

**\*\*Justification:\*\*** This paper addresses an important topic but suffers from fundamental methodological flaws that undermine its conclusions. The uncritical treatment of a single contested dataset, lack of comparative validation, and overstated claims about epistemic impacts prevent it from making a substantive contribution to the literature. While the topic merits investigation, this particular study does not meet the rigorous standards required for publication in a top-tier venue. The paper would require substantial additional research and methodological refinement to become acceptable.

—

**\*\*Reviewer 2 Style Compliance:\*\*** This assessment maintains appropriate skepticism about methodological rigor and requires strong justification for claims about data credibility and impact. The burden of proof remains on the authors to demonstrate their dataset's reliability and their findings' significance beyond descriptive case study.

## Human Reviewer

*Expert human review providing domain-specific insights*

Reviewer: Dr. Ghali

Scores (out of 10): - Question 1: 1.5 - Question 2: 0.5 - Question 3: 0 - Question 4: 0 - Question 5: 0.25 - Question 6: 0 - Question 7: 0

Total Score: 2.25 / 10

Reviewer Notes:

Submitted at: 2025-12-25 01:24:39

## Aggregate Review

*Combined assessment from all reviewers*

### Aggregate Review Report

This report combines the assessments from all three reviewers:

Individual Scores: - AI Reviewer 1 (Comprehensive): 6.0 / 10 - AI Reviewer 2 (Critical): 0.0 / 10  
- Human Reviewer (Dr. Ghali): 2.25 / 10

Aggregate Score: 2.75 / 10

Overall Assessment: The paper received an average score of 2.75 out of 10 across all three reviewers.

Final Decision: Reject

Justification: The paper does not currently meet the minimum standards for publication.

Generated: 2026-01-06 14:16:32