

# Unknown Paper

## AI Reviewer 1 - Comprehensive Review

*This reviewer provides a thorough and balanced assessment*

**\*\*Review of "QUANTIFYING CIVILIAN VULNERABILITY: A MIXED-METHODS ANALYSIS OF GAZA CASUALTIES AND FAMINE-RELATED DEATHS (2023–2025)"\*\***

\\ \\ **\*\* Step 1. Summary of the Paper\*\*** This manuscript analyzes civilian casualties and famine-related deaths in Gaza from October 2023 to October 2025 using a concurrent triangulation mixed-methods approach. It integrates quantitative analysis of 736 days of casualty data from UN agencies (OCHA, WHO, UNICEF) and the Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ) with qualitative examination of institutional communications. The paper claims to: (1) empirically document casualty patterns, (2) theoretically advance understanding of "data trust" in humanitarian contexts, and (3) methodologically demonstrate mixed-methods triangulation for conflict data. The authors argue that data credibility functions as essential humanitarian infrastructure during systematic communication collapse.

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

\\ \\ \\ **\*\*1. Originality / Novelty\*\*** **\*Qualitative Critique\***: The paper's originality lies in its longitudinal analysis (736 days) and integration of famine-related mortality with conflict casualties. The theoretical framing around "data trust" and epistemic injustice in humanitarian reporting is conceptually innovative. However, the mixed-methods approach itself is well-established in conflict studies. **\*Score\***: 7/10

\\ \\ \\ **\*\*2. Scientific Rigor / Methodology\*\*** **\*Qualitative Critique\***: The research design appropriately addresses the challenges of conflict zone data. However, critical methodological flaws undermine rigor: - **\*\*Source Dependency\*\***: Exclusive reliance on institutional reports without independent verification creates circularity. - **\*\*Selection Bias\*\***: Purposive sampling of UN/CPJ data excludes potentially contradictory sources (e.g., Israeli military reports). - **\*\*Statistical Limitations\*\***: Descriptive statistics and correlations don't establish causality. No sensitivity analysis for underreporting. - **\*\*Ethical Oversight\*\***: While secondary data analysis is noted, deeper ethical considerations regarding positionality and data interpretation are superficial. **\*Score\***: 4/10

\\ \\ \\ **\*\*3. Clarity \ Presentation\*\*** **\*Qualitative Critique\***: The writing is generally clear but suffers from: - Overuse of theoretical jargon ("epistemic authority," "mediated witnessing"). -

Tables are informative but lack statistical uncertainty measures. - Abstract overstates conclusions given methodological limitations. \*Score\*: 6/10

\\\\ \*\*4. Reproducibility \ Transparency\*\* \*Qualitative Critique\*: - \*\*Data Availability\*\*: No indication of shared dataset or code. - \*\*Methodological Gaps\*\*: Insufficient detail on change-point detection algorithms and qualitative coding procedures. - \*\*Transparency\*\*: Acknowledges data constraints but doesn't quantify their impact. \*Score\*: 3/10

\\\\ \*\*5. Significance \ Impact\*\* \*Qualitative Critique\*: Addresses a critically important humanitarian issue. Potential impact is high for humanitarian policy and legal accountability. However, methodological weaknesses limit immediate field-changing potential. \*Score\*: 8/10

\\\\ \*\*6. Ethics \ Integrity\*\* \*Qualitative Critique\*: - \*\*Positionality\*\*: Acknowledged but not critically engaged. The framing appears to presuppose institutional data reliability. - \*\*Conflict of Interest\*\*: No statement regarding authors' institutional affiliations or funding. - \*\*Data Interpretation\*\*: Strong causal language ("systematic targeting") without sufficient evidence. \*Score\*: 5/10

—

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

\\\\ \*\*Major Flaws (Must Address)\*\* 1. \*\*Methodological Circularity\*\*: Address overreliance on the same institutions for both data and credibility assessment. Incorporate alternative data sources or explicitly model selection bias. 2. \*\*Statistical Robustness\*\*: - Apply multiple imputation or Bayesian methods to account for missing data/underreporting. - Include uncertainty intervals in all tables. - Justify choice of correlation metrics over time-series models. 3. \*\*Ethical Framework\*\*: Strengthen the ethical analysis beyond procedural IRB compliance to address power dynamics in knowledge production.

\\\\ \*\*Minor Flaws\*\* 1. \*\*Theoretical Framing\*\*: Reduce jargon and clarify how theoretical concepts directly inform analysis. 2. \*\*Visualization\*\*: Add confidence intervals to tables and time-series plots. 3. \*\*Copyediting\*\*: Fix formatting inconsistencies (e.g., "M IXED -METHODS" in title).

\\\\ \*\*Additional Analyses\*\* 1. \*\*Robustness Checks\*\*: Compare UN data with satellite imagery or social media analysis. 2. \*\*Counterfactual Analysis\*\*: Model expected casualties under different conflict intensity scenarios. 3. \*\*Stakeholder Analysis\*\*: Include perspectives from affected communities on data credibility.

—

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

\\\\ \*\*Overall Score\*\*: 5/10

\\\\ \*\*Recommendation\*\*: \*\*Reject\*\*

\\\\ \*\*Justification\*\*: This manuscript addresses a timely and critically important topic with a conceptually innovative framework. However, \*\*fatal methodological flaws\*\* preclude publication in its current form:

1. **Circular Reasoning**: The study's central claim—that institutional data maintains credibility—is undermined by relying exclusively on those same institutions for evidence. Without independent verification or incorporation of dissenting sources, the analysis becomes self-justifying.
2. **Insufficient Statistical Rigor**: The descriptive approach fails to account for systematic uncertainties in conflict data. The lack of probabilistic modeling or sensitivity analysis renders the quantitative findings suggestive rather than conclusive.
3. **Unsubstantiated Causal Claims**: Language implying "systematic targeting" and "structural violence" exceeds what the methodological approach can support, potentially compromising objectivity.
4. **Reproducibility Barriers**: Absence of shared data/code and insufficient methodological detail prevent independent verification.

The paper's significant potential impact warrants a **thorough revision** addressing these concerns. Specifically, the authors should:

- Diversify data sources to include non-UN perspectives
- Implement robust statistical methods accounting for missing data
- Temper causal language to align with methodological limitations
- Enhance transparency through data/code sharing

While the topic demands scholarly attention, the current manuscript does not meet the evidential standards required for a high-impact publication. I encourage resubmission after substantial methodological revision.

—

## AI Reviewer 2 - Critical Review

*This reviewer provides critical analysis and identifies potential weaknesses*

### **\*\*REVIEWER COMMENTS\*\***

**\*\*1. Overall Impression\*\*** My immediate reaction is one of significant methodological concern. While the topic is undoubtedly important and timely, the study relies entirely on institutional reporting without adequate critical examination of potential biases or verification mechanisms. The manuscript reads more like a synthesis of existing humanitarian reports than an independent scholarly contribution. The central concept of "data trust" is theoretically underdeveloped and the mixed-methods approach appears to validate rather than critically interrogate the data sources.

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

**\*\*A. Problem Definition: 3/5\*\*** • The research question is clearly motivated and addresses an important humanitarian challenge. • However, the framing assumes institutional reporting as the primary object of study rather than critically examining its relationship to ground truth.

**\*\*B. Methodological Soundness: 2/5\*\*** • Critical flaw: The study treats institutional reports as authoritative sources without implementing independent verification mechanisms. • The "triangulation" merely compares different institutional reports rather than validating against external evidence. • No sensitivity analysis for potential systematic biases in reporting. • Statistical methods are basic descriptive analyses without addressing fundamental measurement uncertainty.

**\*\*C. Results \ Evidence: 2/5\*\*** • Results are essentially repackaged institutional statistics without novel analytical insights. • Missing critical baselines: No comparison with satellite imagery, social media analysis, or other independent verification methods. • Claims about data trust are asserted rather than demonstrated through empirical testing. • The correlation analyses are methodologically weak and potentially misleading given data limitations.

**\*\*D. Contribution to the Field: 2/5\*\*** • Primarily documents rather than advances methodological approaches to conflict data. • Theoretical contribution to "data trust" literature is superficial. • Does not provide new tools or frameworks for addressing the fundamental verification challenges it identifies.

**\*\*E. Writing \ Presentation: 4/5\*\*** • Well-organized and clearly written. • Tables are comprehensive but could better highlight analytical insights rather than just reporting statistics.

**\*\*F. Ethical \ Transparency Standards: 3/5\*\*** • Appropriate use of secondary data. • However, data/code availability not explicitly addressed. • Positionality statement is adequate but doesn't sufficiently address potential institutional capture in analysis.

**\*\*3. Strengths\*\*** • Comprehensive compilation of institutional data across 736-day period. • Clear documentation of temporal patterns in reporting. • Important focus on understudied aspect of humanitarian response.

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

**\*\*Major Flaws:\*\*** • Fundamental methodological circularity: Uses institutional reports both as data source and object of study without independent validation. • No critical examination of

potential political or institutional biases in reporting. • Theoretical framework for "data trust" is underdeveloped and applied superficially. • Missing comparative analysis with other conflict contexts to establish generalizability. • Statistical analysis lacks sophistication given the complexity of the data.

**\*\*Minor Flaws:\*\*** • Some tables could be more effectively designed to highlight key findings. • Terminology around "data trust" needs clearer operationalization. • Limited discussion of alternative explanations for observed patterns.

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

**\*\*Required Revisions:\*\*** 1. Develop and implement independent verification methods (satellite data analysis, social media cross-validation, ground truth sampling where possible). 2. Conduct systematic bias analysis of institutional reporting across different phases of conflict. 3. Strengthen theoretical framework for "data trust" with clearer operationalization and testing. 4. Include comparative analysis with other conflict contexts to establish methodological generalizability. 5. Implement more sophisticated statistical modeling that accounts for measurement uncertainty.

**\*\*For Future Submission:\*\*** • Design study to independently verify a subset of reported figures through alternative methods. • Develop predictive models that could identify potential reporting anomalies. • Include interviews with data collectors to understand methodological constraints firsthand. • Conduct receiver analysis to understand how different stakeholders interpret and use the data.

**\*\*6. Verdict: 2/5 (Weak Reject)\*\***

**\*\*Justification:\*\*** While the topic is critically important, the study suffers from fundamental methodological limitations that undermine its scientific contribution. The complete reliance on institutional reporting without independent verification creates an unresolvable circularity in the analysis. The theoretical development of "data trust" remains superficial, and the analytical methods do not adequately address the profound measurement challenges inherent in conflict data. The paper currently documents patterns in humanitarian reporting rather than providing novel insights into data credibility or verification methodologies. Substantial methodological redesign and theoretical development would be required for this to constitute a meaningful scholarly contribution to a Tier-1 venue.

—

**\*\*Reviewer 2 Style Compliance:\*\*** I have maintained a skeptical stance throughout, focusing on methodological rigor and demanding stronger evidence for claims about data credibility. The burden of proof remains appropriately on the authors to demonstrate their analytical approach can meaningfully address the verification challenges they identify.

## Human Reviewer

*Expert human review providing domain-specific insights*

Reviewer: Shakeel

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

Total Score: 1.25 / 10

Reviewer Notes:

Submitted at: 2025-12-24 18:28:30

## 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): 0.0 / 10 - AI Reviewer 2 (Critical): 0.0 / 10  
- Human Reviewer (Shakeel): 1.25 / 10

Aggregate Score: 0.42 / 10

Overall Assessment: The paper received an average score of 0.42 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 14:16:38