

# Unknown Paper

## AI Reviewer 1 - Comprehensive Review

*This reviewer provides a thorough and balanced assessment*

**\*\*Review of "THE ARCHITECTURE OF DETENTION: ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL, TORTURE, AND EPISTEMIC TRUST UNDER GAZA HOSTILITIES (2023-2025)"\*\***

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

This manuscript examines administrative detention practices during the Gaza hostilities (2023-2025) as a mechanism of population-level control. The authors analyze data from approximately 9,400 Palestinian detainees using a mixed-methods approach combining quantitative trend analysis (from human rights organizations like OHCHR, B'Tselem, HaMoked) and qualitative thematic coding of 114 witness testimonies. The central claim is that administrative detention systematically creates conditions incompatible with human survival, potentially meeting the threshold for Article II(c) of the Genocide Convention ("deliberately inflicting conditions of life calculated to bring about physical destruction"). The paper argues that bureaucratic procedures, combined with epistemic silencing through restricted monitoring access, function as an "architecture" producing slow mortality through systematic deprivation.

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

\\\ **\*\*1. Originality / Novelty\*\* \*\*Score: 7/10\*\***

The paper synthesizes human rights documentation with theoretical frameworks from genocide studies (Feierstein), epistemic injustice (Fricker), and state-of-exception theory (Agamben) in a conflict context. While human rights reporting on detention conditions exists, the systematic integration of quantitative mortality correlations with qualitative testimonial analysis to argue for Genocide Convention applicability represents a novel contribution. However, the core concept of administrative detention as population control in conflict zones has been explored in previous scholarship (Daniele \ Borralho 2025, Hill-Cawthorne 2016).

\\\ **\*\*2. Scientific Rigor / Methodology\*\* \*\*Score: 5/10\*\***

**\*\*Major concerns:\*\*** - **\*\*Secondary data limitations:\*\*** Complete reliance on human rights organization data without methodological critique of collection procedures, potential selection biases, or verification mechanisms. - **\*\*Causal overreach:\*\*** Strong correlational findings (e.g.,  $r=0.86$  between

overcrowding and mortality) are presented as evidence of systematic causation without addressing confounding variables or alternative explanations. - **Sampling justification:** Purposive sampling of 114 testimonies from millions affected requires stronger justification for representativeness. - **Missing methodological details:** No inter-coder reliability statistics provided for qualitative coding, no documentation of how "medical access" was quantified across facilities.

**Strengths:** Methodological triangulation attempt and comprehensive data sources are appropriate for the research questions.

\\\\ **3. Clarity \ Presentation** **Score: 6/10**

The paper is generally well-structured with clear section organization. However: - **Terminology issues:** Heavy reliance on theoretical jargon ("epistemic silencing," "testimonial erasure") without operational definitions. - **Overstated conclusions:** Abstract and conclusions contain strong legal claims ("fulfills Genocide Convention conditions") that exceed the evidentiary support. - **Table formatting:** Tables are informative but lack standard errors, confidence intervals, or measures of variance. - **Writing style:** Dense academic prose may limit accessibility to interdisciplinary audiences.

\\\\ **4. Reproducibility \ Transparency** **Score: 3/10**

**Critical flaws:** - No data availability statement or access to raw datasets. - Qualitative coding framework not provided (codebook, decision rules). - Missing statistical details: No information on statistical tests beyond correlation coefficients, no model specifications. - Witness testimony sources are anonymized, preventing verification.

\\\\ **5. Significance \ Impact** **Score: 8/10**

The paper addresses an urgent humanitarian crisis with potential implications for: - International legal proceedings regarding Gaza hostilities - Humanitarian policy on detention monitoring - Methodological approaches to human rights documentation The findings could influence both academic discourse and practical interventions in conflict zones.

\\\\ **6. Ethics \ Integrity** **Score: 6/10**

**Concerns:** - **Positionality:** Lack of reflexivity regarding researchers' relationship to the conflict. - **Informed consent:** Unclear if secondary use of testimonies respected original consent agreements. - **Trauma sensitivity:** No discussion of ethical protocols for analyzing traumatic testimony.

**Strengths:** Proper attribution to human rights organizations, acknowledgment of monitoring limitations.

—

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

\\\\ **Major Revisions Required:**

1. **Methodological transparency:** - Provide full statistical output including confidence intervals, p-values, and effect sizes. - Include qualitative codebook with code definitions and examples. - Document data cleaning and processing procedures.

2. **Causal claims moderation:** - Reframe conclusions to acknowledge correlational nature of findings. - Discuss potential confounding variables (e.g., general humanitarian conditions in Gaza). - Consider alternative explanations for observed patterns.
3. **Theoretical framework:** - Operationalize key theoretical terms for empirical application. - Justify framework selection over competing explanations. - Strengthen the connection between empirical findings and legal analysis.
4. **Ethical considerations:** - Add section on researcher positionality and reflexivity. - Document ethical review process for secondary trauma data. - Discuss limitations of human rights data more critically.

#### \\ \\ \\ **Minor Revisions:**

1. Improve table readability with consistent formatting and clear captions.
2. Define all acronyms at first use (OHCHR, PHRI, ICRC).
3. Standardize citation format throughout references.
4. Reduce jargon and improve narrative flow in discussion section.

#### \\ \\ \\ **Additional Analyses to Strengthen:**

1. Conduct multivariate regression to isolate detention condition effects from other variables.
2. Perform sensitivity analysis for different coding schemes in qualitative analysis.
3. Add comparative analysis with detention practices in other conflict zones.
4. Include power analysis for statistical findings.

—

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

#### \\ \\ \\ **Overall Score: 5.8/10**

#### \\ \\ \\ **Recommendation: REJECT**

#### **Justification:**

While this manuscript addresses a critically important humanitarian issue with potential field-changing implications, it currently suffers from fatal methodological flaws that preclude publication in a high-impact journal. The complete reliance on secondary data without critical examination of collection methodologies, the overinterpretation of correlational findings as causal evidence, and the lack of transparency in analytical procedures undermine the scientific validity of its central claims.

The strong legal conclusions regarding Genocide Convention applicability are not sufficiently supported by the presented evidence and represent an overreach beyond the study's methodological capabilities. The paper would require fundamental restructuring, additional primary data collection, and significant methodological refinement to meet the standards of rigorous scientific inquiry expected at this level.

However, the topic remains vitally important, and with substantial revision addressing the concerns above, this research could make a valuable contribution to the literature on human rights documentation and conflict studies.

—

\*\*Reviewer 01\*\* \*Expert in Human Rights Documentation and Conflict Studies\* \*Double-blind peer review\*

## AI Reviewer 2 - Critical Review

*This reviewer provides critical analysis and identifies potential weaknesses*

**\*\*Review of "THE ARCHITECTURE OF DETENTION: ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL, TORTURE, AND EPISTEMIC TRUST UNDER GAZA HOSTILITIES (2023–2025)"\*\***

**\*\*1. Overall Impression\*\*** • **\*\*Immediate reaction:\*\*** Methodologically ambitious but substantively problematic. The paper attempts a high-stakes legal analysis using human rights documentation with insufficient methodological rigor for the claims being advanced. • **\*\*Contribution level:\*\*** Incremental at best in methodology, but dangerously overhyped in its legal conclusions. The attempt to connect detention practices to genocide under Article II(c) represents a significant overreach given the evidence presented. • **\*\*First impression strengths:\*\*** Comprehensive data compilation from multiple human rights sources, clear writing structure, timely topic. • **\*\*First impression concerns:\*\*** Methodological overreach, confirmation bias in analysis, inappropriate legal conclusions from descriptive data.

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

**\*\*A. Problem Definition: 3/5\*\*** • The research question is clearly motivated from a human rights perspective but lacks scientific neutrality. The framing assumes rather than demonstrates systematic intent. • The problem's importance is overstated - while detention conditions are concerning, the leap to genocide claims requires substantially more evidence than presented.

**\*\*B. Methodological Soundness: 2/5\*\*** • **\*\*Major flaw:\*\*** The mixed-methods design claims triangulation but demonstrates confirmation bias. Qualitative and quantitative components appear selected to reinforce predetermined conclusions. • **\*\*Statistical limitations:\*\*** Correlation analysis ( $r=0.86$  between overcrowding and mortality) is presented as causal evidence. No controls for confounding variables (age, pre-existing conditions, conflict-related injuries). • **\*\*Sampling bias:\*\*** Exclusive reliance on human rights organizations without methodological critique of their data collection procedures or potential advocacy biases.

**\*\*C. Results \ Evidence: 2/5\*\*** • **\*\*Reproducibility concerns:\*\*** No access to raw data or coding protocols. Thematic analysis of 114 testimonies lacks intercoder reliability statistics. • **\*\*Baseline issues:\*\*** No comparison to detention conditions in other conflict zones or historical contexts to establish what constitutes "systematic" versus "contextual" deprivation. • **\*\*Exaggeration evident:\*\*** Claims about genocide thresholds are not supported by the correlational evidence presented.

**\*\*D. Contribution to the Field: 2/5\*\*** • The methodological approach of integrating human rights data is potentially useful but undermined by advocacy positioning. • Legal analysis lacks the rigor expected in international law scholarship - no engagement with counterarguments or threshold debates in genocide jurisprudence.

**\*\*E. Writing \ Presentation: 4/5\*\*** • Well-organized and clearly written, though the advocacy tone undermines scientific credibility. • Tables are comprehensive but sometimes misleading (e.g., presenting correlations as evidence of systematic intent).

**\*\*F. Ethical \ Transparency Standards: 1/5\*\*** • **\*\*Critical flaw:\*\*** No discussion of researcher positionality or potential conflicts of interest despite clear advocacy orientation. • **\*\*Data availability:\*\*** No indication of IRB approval for secondary data use or data sharing plans. • **\*\*Ethical concern:\*\***

Using witness testimony for academic publication without clear informed consent procedures for secondary analysis.

**\*\*3. Strengths\*\*** • Comprehensive compilation of human rights data from multiple sources • Clear articulation of methodological approach • Important documentation of detention conditions during ongoing conflict • Theoretically sophisticated framing using epistemic injustice and conditions-of-life frameworks

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

**\*\*Major Flaws:\*\*** • **\*\*Methodological overreach:\*\*** Claims of "methodological triangulation" while using exclusively advocacy-oriented sources • **\*\*Causal overinterpretation:\*\*** Presenting correlations as evidence of systematic intent • **\*\*Legal overreach:\*\*** Inappropriate genocide claims without meeting legal standards of proof • **\*\*Selection bias:\*\*** No critical examination of human rights organizations' methodologies or potential biases • **\*\*Positionality blindness:\*\*** No acknowledgment of researcher standpoint in highly politicized context

**\*\*Minor Flaws:\*\*** • Inconsistent citation formatting • Overuse of theoretical jargon in results section • Tables lack confidence intervals for correlation coefficients • No discussion of data limitations from human rights documentation practices

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

**\*\*Required for Resubmission:\*\*** 1. Remove all genocide claims unless supported by legal analysis that engages with genocide jurisprudence and standards of proof 2. Add rigorous critique of human rights data methodologies and limitations 3. Include control analyses comparing to detention conditions in other conflicts 4. Acknowledge researcher positionality and potential advocacy biases 5. Provide intercoder reliability statistics for qualitative analysis 6. Add confidence intervals and acknowledge limitations of correlational analysis

**\*\*Strengthening Revisions:\*\*** 1. Engage with scholarship critical of human rights methodology in conflict zones 2. Include alternative explanations for observed patterns (resource constraints, security concerns, etc.) 3. Develop more nuanced theoretical framework that doesn't presuppose systematic intent 4. Consider collaborative analysis with diverse methodological perspectives

**\*\*6. Verdict: 2/5 - Weak Reject\*\***

**\*\*Justification:\*\*** This paper demonstrates serious methodological and ethical flaws that fundamentally undermine its conclusions. The advocacy orientation compromises scientific objectivity, while the leap from descriptive data to genocide claims represents scholarly overreach. The exclusive reliance on human rights documentation without critical methodological examination creates confirmation bias. While the topic is important and the data compilation valuable, the paper in its current form cannot be published in a rigorous scientific venue without complete methodological restructuring and removal of unsupported legal conclusions. The work might be suitable for advocacy publications or human rights reports, but lacks the scientific rigor expected in academic journals.

---

**\*\*Reviewer 2 Style Addendum:\*\*** This review adopts the required skeptical stance. The burden of proof for genocide claims is exceptionally high, and this manuscript fails to meet it. The authors

must either substantially temper their conclusions or provide dramatically stronger evidence. The methodological triangulation claimed is illusory when all data sources share similar advocacy orientations. I remain unconvinced that this represents rigorous scholarship rather than sophisticated advocacy.

## Human Reviewer

*Expert human review providing domain-specific insights*

Reviewer: Abdullah

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

Total Score: 9 / 10

Reviewer Notes:

Submitted at: 2025-12-24 18:10:33



## 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 (Abdullah): 9 / 10

Aggregate Score: 5.33 / 10

Overall Assessment: The paper received an average score of 5.33 out of 10 across all three reviewers.

Final Decision: Minor Revision

Justification: The paper shows promise but requires minor improvements before publication.

Generated: 2026-01-06 14:16:35