

# Unknown Paper

## AI Reviewer 1 - Comprehensive Review

*This reviewer provides a thorough and balanced assessment*

**\*\*Review of "FOOD SECURITY UNDER SIEGE: MIXED-METHODS EVIDENCE FROM UNRWA SITUATION REPORT AND CORROBORATING UN SOURCES (OCT2023–AUG2025)"\*\***

\\ \\ **\*\* Step 1. Summary of the Paper\*\*** This manuscript employs a concurrent triangulation mixed-methods design to analyze the food security crisis in Gaza from October 2023 to August 2025. The authors integrate quantitative operational data from UNRWA situation reports (e.g., distribution metrics, coverage rates) with qualitative evidence from UN agencies (WHO, WFP, OCHA) and legal documents (ICJ rulings). The paper claims to: (1) demonstrate how credibility in food security reporting is constructed under siege conditions; (2) document the systematic erosion of food access and its alignment with famine thresholds and legal frameworks; and (3) reveal the transformation of humanitarian data from needs-assessment tools into evidence of "conditions-of-life risks." Key findings include severe declines in food distribution coverage, rising child malnutrition, and institutional concordance among UN agencies in framing the crisis.

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

\\ \\ \\ **\*\*1. Originality / Novelty\*\*** **\*\*Score: 6/10\*\*** - **\*\*Strengths\*\***: The integration of operational data with legal frameworks (e.g., ICJ provisional measures) and epistemic justice theory (Fricker, 2007) is a novel angle. The focus on "credibility construction" in humanitarian reporting under siege adds conceptual depth. - **\*\*Weaknesses\*\***: The mixed-methods approach is well-established in humanitarian research, and the reliance on publicly available UN data limits methodological innovation. The core findings (e.g., food access deterioration) are consistent with existing reports, raising questions about substantive novelty.

\\ \\ \\ **\*\*2. Scientific Rigor / Methodology\*\*** **\*\*Score: 5/10\*\*** - **\*\*Strengths\*\***: The mixed-methods design is appropriate for the research questions. The use of triangulation and reflexivity practices enhances validity. - **\*\*Critical Flaws\*\***: - **\*\*Data Limitations\*\***: The quantitative analysis relies solely on UNRWA situation reports without independent verification or primary data. No statistical tests (e.g., regression) are used to establish causality or control for confounding variables. - **\*\*Temporal Scope\*\***: The study includes data up to August 2025, yet the manuscript is presumably submitted in 2024. This undermines credibility and suggests fabricated or projected data. - **\*\*Sampling Bias\*\***: Qualitative documents are purposively selected from UN sources, potentially

excluding dissenting narratives (e.g., from Israeli authorities or independent audits). - **Ethical Oversight**: No mention of IRB approval or ethical review for secondary data analysis involving sensitive conflict zones.

\\\\ **3. Clarity \ Presentation** **Score: 4/10** - **Strengths**: The structure follows conventional academic formatting, and the abstract clearly outlines contributions. - **Weaknesses**: - **Repetitive Content**: The Results section redundantly repeats quantitative trends (e.g., distribution declines are described multiple times). - **Jargon Overload**: Excessive use of terms like "witness-adjacent narratives" and "epistemic injustice" obscures key messages. - **Missing Tables/Figures**: The manuscript references tables (e.g., Table 1–7) but does not include them, severely impeding reproducibility and clarity. - **Overstated Conclusions**: Claims of "systematic deprivation" are not sufficiently distinguished from broader conflict-induced scarcity.

\\\\ **4. Reproducibility \ Transparency** **Score: 3/10** - **Critical Issues**: - No data or code availability statement. - Missing methodological details: How were correlation coefficients calculated? What specific NVivo coding protocols were used? - The omission of tables/figures makes it impossible to verify quantitative trends or qualitative themes. - Unclear how "witness-adjacent narratives" were sourced or validated.

\\\\ **5. Significance \ Impact** **Score: 7/10** - **Strengths**: Addresses a timely, high-stakes humanitarian crisis with implications for policy, legal accountability, and humanitarian practice. The focus on institutional credibility and legal frameworks could influence how aid agencies document crises. - **Limitations**: Impact is tempered by methodological flaws and reliance on widely reported UN data. The conclusions may be perceived as politicized without robust empirical support.

\\\\ **6. Ethics \ Integrity** **Score: 4/10** - **Concerns**: - **Temporal Inconsistency**: Data extending to 2025 in a 2024 submission suggests ethical breaches in data representation. - **Potential Bias**: Exclusive reliance on UN sources without acknowledging potential institutional biases (e.g., UNRWA's contested role in the conflict). - **Legal Overreach**: The paper implicitly links food security metrics to legal determinations of "systematic deprivation," which may overinterpret data without legal expertise. - **Strengths**: Ethical use of aggregated data to protect vulnerable populations.

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

\\\\ **Major Revisions Required**: 1. **Address Temporal Discrepancy**: Clarify how data up to August 2025 is available in 2024. If projected, use modeling with explicit uncertainty intervals. 2. **Enhance Methodological Rigor**: - Include primary data or independent verification of UN metrics. - Apply inferential statistics (e.g., time-series analysis) to substantiate trends. - Diversify data sources to include non-UN perspectives (e.g., IDF reports, NGO assessments). 3. **Include Missing Elements**: Provide all referenced tables/figures and a data/code repository. 4. **Tone Down Legal Claims**: Reframe conclusions to avoid overstepping into legal determinations without formal legal analysis.

\\\\ **Minor Revisions**: 1. **Reduce Repetition**: Consolidate redundant descriptions in the Results section. 2. **Improve Readability**: Define jargon (e.g., "conditions-of-life risks") and simplify language. 3. **Strengthen Literature Review**: Contrast findings with existing studies

on Gaza food security (e.g., from FAO or independent researchers).

\\\\ \\\*\*Additional Analyses to Strengthen Manuscript\*\*:\\ - Conduct sensitivity analyses to test robustness of correlations. - Compare UNRWA data with satellite-derived indicators (e.g., nighttime lights, vegetation indexes) to cross-verify access constraints. - Include qualitative interviews with aid workers or affected families to complement institutional narratives.

—

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

\\\\ \\\*\*Overall Score: 4/10\*\* \\\\ \\\*\*Recommendation: Reject\*\* \\\*\*Justification\*\*:\\ While the topic is critically important, the manuscript suffers from fatal methodological flaws that cannot be addressed without a complete overhaul. The temporal inconsistency (data up to 2025) alone undermines credibility, and the absence of tables/figures precludes meaningful review. The analysis relies exclusively on UN sources without critical engagement with potential biases or independent verification. The paper's policy and legal implications are overstated given the limited empirical rigor. For a high-impact journal, the work must demonstrate higher standards of transparency, reproducibility, and analytical depth. I encourage the authors to revise the study with robust data, diversified sources, and clearer methodological documentation before resubmission.

—

## AI Reviewer 2 - Critical Review

*This reviewer provides critical analysis and identifies potential weaknesses*

**\*\*Overall Impression\*\*** After thorough review, this manuscript presents a methodologically ambitious but fundamentally flawed analysis of food security in Gaza. While the humanitarian crisis is undeniably significant, the paper fails to meet the rigorous standards expected of a Tier-1 venue. The study attempts to integrate mixed-methods approaches but suffers from critical weaknesses in novelty, methodological transparency, and analytical depth. The work reads more as a descriptive synthesis of UN reports than a novel scholarly contribution. Strengths include comprehensive data aggregation and alignment with legal frameworks, but these are overshadowed by overstated claims, lack of comparative baselines, and insufficient critical engagement with source limitations.

\\\ **\*\*Technical \ Scientific Assessment\*\*** \*(Scores: 0 = Unacceptable, 5 = Outstanding)\*

**\*\*A. Problem Definition\*\*** - **\*\*Score: 3/5\*\*** - The research question is clearly motivated but lacks novelty. The authors adequately argue the humanitarian significance but fail to demonstrate how their approach advances beyond existing literature on food security in conflict zones. The framing leans heavily on established UN and legal frameworks without introducing a unique theoretical or empirical gap.

**\*\*B. Methodological Soundness\*\*** - **\*\*Score: 2/5\*\*** - The mixed-methods design is appropriate but poorly executed. Key methodological details are omitted: - No justification for sampling criteria (e.g., why 42 qualitative documents?). - No discussion of potential biases in UN-derived data (e.g., political constraints on reporting). - Statistical analysis is purely descriptive (means, correlations), with no inferential tests or robustness checks. - Triangulation is claimed but not demonstrated rigorously (e.g., no discordant evidence is explored).

**\*\*C. Results \ Evidence\*\*** - **\*\*Score: 2/5\*\*** - Results are descriptive and lack comparative context: - No baseline data (e.g., pre-2023 food security levels) to contextualize "systematic deprivation." - Claims of "institutional concordance" are circular—using UN data to validate UN conclusions. - Correlation analyses are overinterpreted (e.g.,  $r=0.89$  between access days and stock levels implies tautology). - No sensitivity analysis for missing data or reporting gaps during conflict.

**\*\*D. Contribution to the Field\*\*** - **\*\*Score: 2/5\*\*** - The work synthesizes existing UN reports but does not advance theoretical or practical knowledge. It replicates rather than challenges or expands upon IPC/UN methodologies. The claim of "epistemic injustice" is superficially applied without engaging deeply with Fricker's framework or proposing corrective mechanisms.

**\*\*E. Writing \ Presentation\*\*** - **\*\*Score: 3/5\*\*** - The paper is logically organized but excessively verbose, with repetitive phrasing (e.g., "systematic deprivation" appears 20+ times). Figures/tables are descriptive but lack statistical rigor. The abstract overstates conclusions relative to evidence.

**\*\*F. Ethical \ Transparency Standards\*\*** - **\*\*Score: 4/5\*\*** - Ethical oversight (e.g., secondary data use) is appropriately addressed. Data sources are clearly cited, but code/analysis scripts are not shared, limiting reproducibility. No evidence of misconduct, though reliance on politicized UN sources warrants deeper critical reflection.

\\ \\ **\*\*Strengths\*\*** 1. Comprehensive aggregation of multi-agency UN data (UNRWA, WHO, WFP, etc.). 2. Integration of quantitative metrics with qualitative themes (e.g., "witness-adjacent narratives"). 3. Alignment with international legal frameworks (ICJ, IPC) adds policy relevance.

\\ \\ **\*\*Weaknesses\*\*** **\*\*Major Flaws:\*\*** 1. **\*\*Lack of Novelty:\*\*** Repackages UN reports without new theoretical insights or empirical findings. 2. **\*\*Methodological Opaqueness:\*\*** No details on qualitative coding reliability (e.g., inter-coder agreement) or quantitative model specifications. 3. **\*\*Circular Argumentation:\*\*** Uses UN data to validate UN claims without independent verification. 4. **\*\*Overstated Claims:\*\*** Asserts "systematic deprivation" but does not rule out alternative explanations (e.g., conflict-induced supply chain collapse vs. intentional policy). 5. **\*\*No Comparative Baselines:\*\*** Fails to contrast Gaza with other conflict zones or pre-crisis trends.

**\*\*Minor Flaws:\*\*** - Repetitive phrasing (e.g., "conditions-of-life risks"). - Inconsistent citation style (e.g., "Fricker (2007)" vs. "Ballis \ Schwendemann (2022)"). - Tables referenced in text (e.g., Table 1–7) are absent from the submitted draft.

\\ \\ **\*\*Recommendations for Improvement\*\*** 1. **\*\*Strengthen Methodology:\*\*** - Provide inter-coder reliability metrics for qualitative analysis. - Apply inferential statistics (e.g., time-series regression) to test causal relationships. - Include sensitivity analyses for missing data. 2. **\*\*Enhance Novelty:\*\*** - Contrast UN data with non-UN sources (e.g., NGO reports, satellite imagery) to test robustness. - Develop a theoretical framework explaining how institutional concordance builds credibility. 3. **\*\*Address Alternative Explanations:\*\*** - Discuss whether observed patterns reflect intentional deprivation or collateral effects of conflict. - Compare Gaza with other sieges (e.g., Syria, Yemen) to contextualize findings. 4. **\*\*Improve Presentation:\*\*** - Condense repetitive sections. - Include all referenced tables/figures. - Clarify legal analysis (e.g., how ICJ measures directly link to food security metrics).

\\ \\ **\*\*Verdict\*\*** **\*\*Overall Score: 2/5 – Weak Reject\*\***

**\*\*Justification:\*\*** This paper falls short of Tier-1 standards due to fundamental methodological and conceptual flaws. While the topic is critically important, the analysis does not advance beyond a synthesis of publicly available UN data. The lack of comparative baselines, circular validation of sources, and insufficient statistical rigor undermine its claims. The authors must substantially revise the methodology, engage with counterfactuals, and demonstrate novel insights to warrant reconsideration. In its current form, it is better suited for a policy brief or regional report than a high-impact academic journal.

**\*\* Reviewer 2 Style Addendum:\*\*** - \*Demand stronger justification for novelty claims.\* - \*Reject appeals to humanitarian urgency as a substitute for scholarly rigor.\* - \*Insist on transparency in coding protocols and data sharing.\*

## Human Reviewer

*Expert human review providing domain-specific insights*

Reviewer: Ragheed

Scores (out of 10): - Question 1: 1.5 - Question 2: 1 - Question 3: 1.5 - Question 4: 0.75 - Question 5: 0.75 - Question 6: 1 - Question 7: 1.5

Total Score: 8 / 10

Reviewer Notes:

Submitted at: 2025-12-24 18:17:52

## 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 (Ragheed): 8 / 10

Aggregate Score: 4.67 / 10

Overall Assessment: The paper received an average score of 4.67 out of 10 across all three reviewers.

Final Decision: Major Revision

Justification: The paper has potential but requires substantial improvements before it can be considered for publication.

Generated: 2026-01-06 14:16:45