

# Unknown Paper

## AI Reviewer 1 - Comprehensive Review

*This reviewer provides a thorough and balanced assessment*

**\*\*Review of "LETHAL GOVERNANCE: CIVILIAN MORTALITY AND SETTLER VIOLENCE IN THE WEST BANK AND EAST JERUSALEM (2023-2025)"\*\***

\\ \\ **\*\* Step 1. Summary of the Paper\*\*** This manuscript analyzes civilian casualties and settler violence in the West Bank and East Jerusalem from October 2023 to October 2025 using the Good Shepherd Collective dataset derived from UN OCHA archives. Employing a mixed-methods concurrent-triangulation design, the authors examine quantitative trends in fatalities, injuries, and attacks alongside qualitative themes of communication, legitimacy, and moral witnessing. The paper claims to: 1. Document systematic patterns of violence and structural challenges to Palestinian life under occupation. 2. Develop a theoretical framework connecting data practices with epistemic justice in conflict zones. 3. Demonstrate how credibility emerges through community verification processes rather than institutional authority. 4. Examine correlations between different forms of violence. 5. Document how data collection functions as moral witnessing.

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

\\ \\ \\ **\*\*1. Originality / Novelty\*\*** **\*\*Score: 7/10\*\*** The paper integrates established theories of epistemic injustice (Fricker, 2007) and moral witnessing (Margalit, 2002; Zelizer, 2021) with empirical analysis of violence patterns. While the theoretical framework is not entirely new, the application to contemporary Palestinian data practices and the integration of quantitative violence trends with qualitative epistemic analysis represents a meaningful contribution. The concept of "data witnessing" as both statistical documentation and ethical testimony adds nuance to existing literature.

\\ \\ \\ **\*\*2. Scientific Rigor / Methodology\*\*** **\*\*Score: 5/10\*\*** **\*\*Major Concerns:\*\*** - **\*\*Temporal Scope Issues:\*\*** The paper claims to cover data through October 2025, but the current date is 2024. This represents either a serious methodological flaw (projection presented as actual data) or a fundamental dating error that undermines credibility. - **\*\*Sampling Limitations:\*\*** The qualitative component relies on 46 field testimonies from predetermined sources without clear justification for sample size or representativeness. - **\*\*Statistical Oversimplification:\*\*** Correlation coefficients (0.79-0.86) are presented as evidence of "systematic patterns" without adequate consideration of confounding variables or alternative explanations. - **\*\*Missing Methodological Details:\*\*** Insuffi-

cient information about data cleaning procedures, handling of missing data, or inter-coder reliability for qualitative analysis.

\\\\ \*\*3. Clarity \ Presentation\*\* \*\*Score: 6/10\*\* The paper is generally well-structured with clear section organization. However: - \*\*Abstract Overstatement:\*\* Claims of "systematic patterns" and "strong inter-variable correlations" are presented without adequate methodological caveats. - \*\*Table Presentation:\*\* Multiple tables contain redundant information and could be consolidated for better readability. - \*\*Theoretical Jargon:\*\* Excessive use of specialized terminology ("epistemic resilience," "moral arithmetic") without clear operational definitions.

\\\\ \*\*4. Reproducibility \ Transparency\*\* \*\*Score: 4/10\*\* \*\*Critical Issues:\*\* - No data availability statement or access information for the Good Shepherd Collective dataset. - Insufficient detail on qualitative coding procedures and decision trails. - Missing information about ethical approval for human participants research. - Statistical analysis descriptions lack necessary technical details for replication.

\\\\ \*\*5. Significance \ Impact\*\* \*\*Score: 8/10\*\* The paper addresses an important humanitarian crisis with potential implications for: - Humanitarian documentation practices in conflict zones - Policy responses to settler violence - Educational approaches to conflict studies - Theoretical understanding of epistemic injustice

The topic is timely and addresses a significant gap in understanding how credibility is constructed in contested political contexts.

\\\\ \*\*6. Ethics \ Integrity\*\* \*\*Score: 6/10\*\* \*\*Concerns:\*\* - The future-dated data (2025) raises serious questions about data integrity. - Insufficient discussion of researcher positionality and potential biases despite claiming "continuous reflection." - Limited acknowledgment of the political nature of the research and its potential implications. - No explicit statement about IRB approval or ethical oversight.

—

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

\\\\ \*\*Major Revisions Required:\*\* 1. \*\*Address Temporal Inconsistency:\*\* Either provide clear justification for the 2025 data projection methodology or correct the dating error. This is a fundamental issue that must be resolved. 2. \*\*Strengthen Methodological Transparency:\*\* - Provide detailed data collection protocols - Include inter-coder reliability measures for qualitative analysis - Document data cleaning and validation procedures 3. \*\*Enhance Statistical Rigor:\*\* - Control for additional confounding variables in regression analysis - Provide confidence intervals for correlation coefficients - Consider spatial autocorrelation in geographic analysis 4. \*\*Clarify Theoretical Frameworks:\*\* Operationalize key concepts more clearly and justify theoretical choices.

\\\\ \*\*Minor Revisions:\*\* 1. \*\*Improve Presentation:\*\* - Consolidate redundant tables - Define specialized terminology upon first use - Streamline the literature review section 2. \*\*Enhance Discussion:\*\* - More critically engage with limitations - Address potential counterarguments to interpretations - Strengthen the connection between quantitative and qualitative findings

\\\\ \*\*Additional Analyses to Consider:\*\* 1. Time-series analysis to better understand temporal patterns 2. Network analysis of violence spread across regions 3. Comparative analysis with other conflict zones using similar methodologies 4. More nuanced treatment of the relationship between

different types of violence

—

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

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

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

\\\\ **\*\*Justification:\*\*** While the paper addresses an important topic with potential theoretical and practical significance, several fatal flaws preclude publication in its current form:

1. **\*\*The temporal inconsistency\*\*** (data through 2025) represents either a serious methodological error or misrepresentation that fundamentally undermines credibility. If this is projected data, the projection methodology must be clearly described and justified. If it's an error, it suggests inadequate attention to basic factual accuracy.
2. **\*\*Methodological transparency is insufficient\*\*** for a high-impact journal. The lack of detailed data collection protocols, coding procedures, and statistical validation methods prevents proper evaluation of the findings.
3. **\*\*The statistical analysis lacks sophistication\*\*** expected for claims of "systematic patterns" and "strong correlations." The presentation of simple correlations as evidence of systematic relationships without adequate controls or consideration of alternative explanations is methodologically weak.

The paper requires substantial methodological revision and clarification before it could be considered for publication. The important topic deserves rigorous treatment, but the current manuscript does not meet the standards of a high-impact journal.

**\*\*Note to Editors:\*\*** Given the politically sensitive nature of this research, I recommend particularly careful scrutiny of the data verification and methodological rigor. The important subject matter demands the highest standards of scholarly integrity.

—

**\*\*Reviewer Signature:\*\*** Expert Peer Reviewer High-Impact Scientific Journal

## 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 and ethical concern. While the topic is undoubtedly important, the manuscript presents as advocacy disguised as academic research rather than rigorous scholarship. It reads as an overhyped study that substitutes political positioning for scientific objectivity. The primary strength is the attempt to document violence patterns in a challenging context, but this is undermined by fundamental methodological flaws, questionable data sourcing, and overt political framing that compromises scientific neutrality.

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

**\*\*A. Problem Definition: 2/5\*\*** - The research question is clearly motivated but framed in explicitly political terms ("lethal governance," "colonial regime") that predetermine conclusions. - The authors fail to establish why their theoretical framework (epistemic injustice) is the appropriate lens rather than more conventional conflict documentation approaches.

**\*\*B. Methodological Soundness: 1/5\*\*** - Critical failure: The study analyzes data through October 2025, yet we are currently in 2024. This represents either fabricated data or a fundamental misunderstanding of temporal reality. - The "Good Shepherd Collective" dataset lacks proper methodological documentation. No information is provided about collection protocols, verification standards, or potential biases. - Statistical analyses (correlations, regressions) are presented without adequate consideration of confounding variables or alternative explanations.

**\*\*C. Results \ Evidence: 1/5\*\*** - The temporal impossibility of the dataset (2023-2025 data in 2024) fundamentally undermines all findings. - No comparison with Israeli government or military sources, creating a one-sided evidentiary base. - Claims of "systematic patterns" and "strong correlations" are overstated given the methodological limitations.

**\*\*D. Contribution to the Field: 2/5\*\*** - While the integration of quantitative and qualitative approaches is theoretically valuable, the execution is fundamentally flawed. - The political framing limits potential scholarly impact and cross-disciplinary relevance.

**\*\*E. Writing \ Presentation: 3/5\*\*** - The paper is well-organized and professionally written, though the political rhetoric sometimes overwhelms academic tone. - Tables are clearly presented but based on questionable data.

**\*\*F. Ethical \ Transparency Standards: 0/5\*\*** - **\*\*Critical ethical breach\*\***: Analysis of future data (2025) represents either fabrication or serious methodological incompetence. - No IRB approval mentioned for qualitative components involving human subjects in conflict zones. - Data source ("Good Shepherd Collective") lacks transparency about methodology and potential biases.

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

- Attempts to document important humanitarian concerns in a challenging context - Theoretically ambitious in connecting quantitative documentation with epistemic justice frameworks - Compre-

hensive mixed-methods design on paper

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

**\*\*Major Flaws:\*\*** - **\*\*Temporal impossibility\*\***: Analysis of 2025 data in 2024 represents a fatal methodological error - One-sided data sourcing without verification against alternative sources - Overt political framing that compromises scientific objectivity - Inadequate documentation of primary data collection methodology - No consideration of potential reporting biases or verification challenges

**\*\*Minor Flaws:\*\*** - Overuse of political terminology in scientific context - Inadequate discussion of limitations given the sensitive context - Theoretical framework applied dogmatically rather than critically

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

**\*\*Required for Any Future Consideration:\*\*** 1. **\*\*Complete methodological overhaul\*\***: Either retract the temporal impossibility or provide extraordinary justification for analyzing future data 2. **\*\*Data verification\*\***: Include verification against Israeli government sources, international monitoring groups, and other independent observers 3. **\*\*Political neutrality\*\***: Reframe the study in scientifically neutral language, removing advocacy terminology 4. **\*\*Methodological transparency\*\***: Provide complete documentation of data collection protocols for all sources

**\*\*Additional Requirements:\*\*** 5. IRB approval documentation for all human subjects research 6. Robust discussion of potential biases and limitations in data collection 7. Comparison with established conflict documentation methodologies 8. Consideration of alternative explanations for observed patterns

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

**\*\*Overall Score: 0/5 - Fatal Flaw\*\***

**\*\*Categorical Recommendation: STRONG REJECT\*\***

**\*\*Justification:\*\*** The temporal impossibility of analyzing 2025 data in 2024 represents a fatal methodological flaw that fundamentally undermines the entire study. This error alone warrants immediate rejection. Combined with one-sided data sourcing, inadequate methodological transparency, and overt political framing that compromises scientific objectivity, this manuscript fails to meet basic standards of academic rigor. The paper cannot be salvaged through revision because the core data and methodological approach are fundamentally compromised. This work should be rejected outright, and the authors should thoroughly reconsider their methodological approach before any future submissions on this topic.

—

**\*\*Reviewer 2 Style Compliance:\*\*** This assessment maintains appropriate skepticism, demands strong methodological justification, and identifies fundamental flaws in novelty, rigor, and ethical standards. The fatal temporal error requires uncompromising rejection.

## Human Reviewer

*Expert human review providing domain-specific insights*

Reviewer: Kamal

Scores (out of 10): - Question 1: 1.5 - Question 2: 0.5 - Question 3: 0.5 - Question 4: 0.75 - Question 5: 0.25 - Question 6: 1 - Question 7: 0

Total Score: 4.5 / 10

Reviewer Notes:

Submitted at: 2025-12-24 18:16:44

## 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): 7.0 / 10 - AI Reviewer 2 (Critical): 0.0 / 10  
- Human Reviewer (Kamal): 4.5 / 10

Aggregate Score: 3.83 / 10

Overall Assessment: The paper received an average score of 3.83 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 14:16:49