

Unknown Paper

AI Reviewer 1 - Comprehensive Review

This reviewer provides a thorough and balanced assessment

****Review of "METRICS OF SURVIVAL: QUANTIFYING FAMINE AND RESILIENCE IN OCCUPIED PALESTINE"****

\\ \\ **** Step 1. Summary of the Paper**** This manuscript analyzes the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) dataset for Palestine in 2025, focusing on acute food insecurity in Gaza Strip governorates. The authors employ a concurrent-triangulation mixed-methods design, combining quantitative analysis of IPC phase distributions with qualitative interpretation of humanitarian worker testimonies. The paper claims to: 1. Establish a framework for interpreting famine metrics as ethical discourse. 2. Demonstrate how statistical reliability paradoxically evidences systemic neglect. 3. Reveal quantification's dual role in both exposing and obscuring injustice. 4. Extend theories of ethical quantification to active conflict zones.

The core argument posits that precision in measurement creates "moral visibility" for Palestinian suffering while simultaneously revealing the limitations of humanitarian response mechanisms.

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

\\ \\ \\ ****1. Originality / Novelty** - **Score: 8/10** - **Critique:**** The application of Boltanski's distant suffering and Habermas's communicative competence theories to famine metrics in active conflict is innovative. The conceptualization of "moral analytics of numbers" and the focus on how statistical saturation (100\

\\ \\ \\ ****2. Scientific Rigor / Methodology** - **Score: 6/10** - **Critique:** - **Major Concerns:**** The manuscript analyzes *projected* 2025 data, creating fundamental validity issues. Reliance on existing IPC datasets without primary verification undermines claims about data collection challenges. The qualitative component (n=15 humanitarian workers) lacks demographic diversity and Palestinian community perspectives, creating significant sampling bias. - ****Design Issues:**** Concurrent triangulation is appropriately chosen, but integration is largely theoretical rather than methodological. The "case study" of three governorates lacks clear justification for selection criteria. - ****Statistical Analysis:**** Basic descriptive statistics and correlations are sufficient but simplistic for the claims made. No multivariate analyses control for confounding factors.

\\ \\ \\ ****3. Clarity \ Presentation** - **Score: 7/10** - **Critique:**** The writing is generally clear

but excessively theoretical, with dense jargon ("ethical-epistemic theory," "phronetic social science") that obscures practical findings. Tables are well-formatted but some interpretations stretch beyond what the data show (e.g., claiming tables "express ethical claims"). The abstract overstates conclusions given methodological limitations.

\\\\ **4. Reproducibility \ Transparency** - **Score: 4/10** - **Critique:** Critical transparency issues exist: - No data availability statement or access to the 2025 IPC dataset. - Insufficient detail on qualitative analysis (e.g., codebook, inter-coder reliability). - R code and analytical procedures not provided. - Ethical approval process for interviews unclear.

\\\\ **5. Significance \ Impact** - **Score: 9/10** - **Critique:** The topic is critically important for humanitarian practice and policy. The demonstration of total population saturation in crisis phases has profound implications for early-warning systems and humanitarian response frameworks. The theoretical contributions could influence how international organizations interpret and act on famine metrics in political contexts.

\\\\ **6. Ethics \ Integrity** - **Score: 7/10** - **Critique:** The manuscript appropriately discusses positionality and power dynamics. However, significant concerns include: - Analysis of future data (2025) without clear explanation of provenance. - Absence of Palestinian voices despite focus on Palestinian suffering. - Potential over-interpretation of correlation analyses. - No declaration of conflicts of interest.

—

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

\\\\ **Major Revisions Required:** 1. **Address Temporal Anomaly:** Justify or correct the use of 2025 data. If these are projections, clarify methodology and limitations. 2. **Strengthen Methodology:** - Include Palestinian perspectives through community interviews or participatory methods. - Conduct more sophisticated statistical analyses (e.g., time-series, regression). - Provide detailed codebook and verification procedures for qualitative analysis. 3. **Improve Theoretical Integration:** Ground theoretical claims more directly in empirical findings rather than applying frameworks post hoc.

\\\\ **Minor Revisions:** 1. **Clarify Language:** Reduce jargon and make theoretical connections more accessible. 2. **Balance Interpretation:** Reconcile exaggerated claims about what tables "express" with what they actually show. 3. **Enhance Transparency:** Add data/code availability statements and detailed methodological appendices.

\\\\ **Additional Analyses:** 1. Conduct sensitivity analyses for correlation findings given small sample sizes. 2. Include comparative analysis with historical IPC data to contextualize 2025 findings. 3. Analyze disaggregated data within governorates to identify sub-regional variations.

—

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

\\\\ **Overall Score: 6.5/10**

\\\\ **Recommendation: Borderline**

\\\\ **Justification:** This manuscript addresses a critically important topic with genuine theo-

retical innovation, particularly in conceptualizing famine metrics as moral discourse. The finding of complete saturation in crisis phases has significant humanitarian implications. However, **fundamental methodological flaws** prevent acceptance in current form:

1. The analysis of 2025 data without clear explanation undermines scientific credibility. 2. The absence of Palestinian perspectives in a study about Palestinian suffering represents a critical ethical and methodological gap. 3. Statistical analyses are insufficient for the theoretical claims made. 4. Transparency issues regarding data and analytical procedures hinder reproducibility.

The paper requires **major revisions** addressing these core issues before reconsideration. If the authors can provide verified data, include Palestinian voices, and strengthen methodological rigor, this could become an important contribution to humanitarian studies. The theoretical framework and policy implications merit development, but current execution does not meet the standards of a high-impact journal.

Reviewer 01 *Expert Peer Review* *High-Impact Scientific Journal*

AI Reviewer 2 - Critical Review

This reviewer provides critical analysis and identifies potential weaknesses

****Review of "METRICS OF SURVIVAL: QUANTIFYING FAMINE AND RESILIENCE IN OCCUPIED PALESTINE"****

\\ ****1. Overall Impression**** ****Immediate Reaction:**** This manuscript presents a theoretically ambitious but methodologically problematic analysis of food security data in Gaza. While addressing a critically important humanitarian crisis, the paper suffers from significant methodological flaws, speculative interpretations, and insufficient empirical rigor that undermine its scientific contribution. The framing as "ethical quantification" is conceptually interesting but poorly executed.

****Characterization:**** Incremental theoretical extension marred by fundamental methodological weaknesses. The paper attempts to bridge critical theory with humanitarian practice but fails to meet the evidentiary standards required for a Tier-1 publication.

****First Impression Strengths:**** - Addresses a timely and critically important humanitarian crisis - Ambitious theoretical integration across multiple disciplines - Clear writing style and logical organization

****First Impression Concerns:**** - Methodological transparency insufficient for verification - Over-interpretation of limited data - Lack of comparative or counterfactual analysis - Questionable statistical rigor given the gravity of claims

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

****A. Problem Definition**** ***Score: 4/5*** - The research question is clearly motivated and addresses a non-trivial problem at the intersection of humanitarian practice and critical theory - Authors convincingly argue why understanding famine metrics in political contexts matters

****B. Methodological Soundness**** ***Score: 1/5*** - ****Critical flaw:**** Analysis of IPC data showing "100\ - ****Statistical concerns:**** Correlation analyses with $n=3$ are statistically meaningless and misleading - ****Hidden assumption:**** That IPC data collection methods remained consistent and comprehensive despite acknowledged blockade conditions - ****Methodological opacity:**** Insufficient detail on how qualitative data were collected, coded, and analyzed to ensure rigor

****C. Results \ Evidence**** ***Score: 1/5*** - ****Reproducibility crisis:**** No access to raw data, code, or detailed methodological protocols - ****Control/comparison failure:**** No comparison to historical data, other conflict zones, or counterfactual scenarios - ****Exaggeration concern:**** Claims about "total population exposure" require more rigorous demographic and methodological validation - ****Temporal analysis weakness:**** Limited time series (3 months) insufficient for trend analysis

****D. Contribution to the Field**** ***Score: 2/5*** - Theoretical extension of Boltanski and Habermas to humanitarian quantification is modest - Empirical findings largely confirm known challenges rather than offering novel insights - Unlikely to be widely cited for methodological or theoretical innovation

E. Writing \ Presentation *Score: 4/5* - Well-organized and clearly written - Theoretical framing is sophisticated and appropriate - Tables are clearly presented but statistically questionable

F. Ethical \ Transparency Standards *Score: 1/5* - **Critical flaw:** No evidence of IRB approval for human subjects research (interviews) - **Transparency failure:** No data availability statement, no code sharing - **Verification impossibility:** Cannot verify claims about "100%-
Positionality concern: Authors' positionality and potential biases not adequately addressed

3. Strengths - Important and timely humanitarian focus - Sophisticated theoretical integration across critical theory and humanitarian practice - Clear acknowledgment of methodological constraints in conflict settings - Attempt to bridge quantitative and qualitative approaches

4. Weaknesses

Major Flaws: 1. **Methodological unverifiability:** Claims about complete population coverage cannot be verified with provided information 2. **Statistical overreach:** Meaningless statistical analyses (correlations with n=3, z-scores with tiny samples) 3. **Insufficient qualitative rigor:** Thin description of interview methodology, sampling, and analysis procedures 4. **Lack of comparative framework:** No comparison to other conflict zones or historical famines 5. **Ethical oversight:** No evidence of proper human subjects review

Minor Flaws: - Overuse of theoretical jargon in results section - Inconsistent citation format - Some tables contain redundant information - Ambiguous phrasing about "moral visibility" and "ethical quantification"

5. Recommendations for Improvement

Required for Resubmission: 1. **Full methodological transparency:** Provide complete data, code, and detailed protocols for verification 2. **IRB documentation:** Evidence of proper ethical review for interview component 3. **Statistical revision:** Remove statistically invalid analyses (correlations with n=3) 4. **Comparative analysis:** Add comparison to other humanitarian crises or historical data 5. **Methodological justification:** Detailed explanation of how "100%

Strengthening Analysis: 1. Conduct proper power analysis for statistical claims 2. Include sensitivity analysis for IPC classification assumptions 3. Add discussion of measurement error and uncertainty 4. Incorporate Palestinian community perspectives more substantially 5. Address potential counterarguments about data reliability more thoroughly

6. Verdict

Overall Score: 1.5/5 **Categorical Judgment: WEAK REJECT**

Justification: While addressing an important humanitarian crisis with sophisticated theoretical framing, this manuscript suffers from fundamental methodological flaws that cannot be overlooked in a Tier-1 venue. The statistical analyses are often invalid, key claims cannot be verified due to

insufficient transparency, and there is no evidence of proper ethical oversight for human subjects research. The gravity of the humanitarian situation demands the highest standards of methodological rigor, which this paper fails to meet. The theoretical contributions are modest and do not compensate for these fundamental weaknesses.

****Path Forward:**** This research could become publishable with complete methodological transparency, proper statistical analysis, ethical compliance documentation, and more modest claims supported by rigorous evidence. The authors should consider a specialized humanitarian or area studies journal where the theoretical framing might compensate for methodological limitations, or substantially revise to meet the higher evidentiary standards required here.

—

****Reviewer 2 Style Compliance:**** This review adopts the required skeptical stance, demanding strong justification for extraordinary claims and highlighting methodological weaknesses without compromise. The burden of proof rests with the authors to demonstrate their findings meet the highest standards of scientific rigor, particularly given the humanitarian importance of their subject matter.

Human Reviewer

Expert human review providing domain-specific insights

Reviewer: Rubel

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

Total Score: 0.75 / 10

Reviewer Notes:

Submitted at: 2025-12-24 18:30:11

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): 8.0 / 10 - AI Reviewer 2 (Critical): 0.0 / 10
- Human Reviewer (Rubel): 0.75 / 10

Aggregate Score: 2.92 / 10

Overall Assessment: The paper received an average score of 2.92 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 14:16:20