

Manuscript: “**Kidnapped and Made Brides: Advancing Quantum Reparation for Sexual and Gender-based Victims in Conflict Zones**”

Submitted: 30 November 2020

Accepted: 12 February 2021

Published: 30 April 2021

Corresponding Author: Olayinka Oluwakemi Adeniyi

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n13p60

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr. Peter O. O. Ottuh, Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Samuel Adegboyega University Ogwa, Nigeria

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Dr. Han Hettiarachchi, Sri Lanka

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The title is clear and adequate. However, the title is too long. I suggest that the title should be streamlined.

E.G.: "Kidnapped and made brides: Making a case of Quantum Reparation for victims of sexual and gender based abuses in conflict zones"

The scope or focus can be revealed and expanded on in the body of the work.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The abstract is fairly adequate. It should be improved.

An abstract is a brief of the entire work. A good abstract should include among other things: Brief introduction of the subject, aim, significance, the method adopted, findings (results), recommendations and conclusion.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

Check carefully and edit the text accordingly. E.g. where quotation marks are used, there must be signs of quotation marks 'opened' and 'closed'.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Not adequately provided

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)
The contents of the work are well written.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)
The conclusion is adequate.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.
(Please insert your comments)
The references are comprehensive, current and adequate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3

- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper is publishable. However, my comments as highlighted above should be considered.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The title is very long and needs to be shortened per APA rules for titles.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The abstract is poorly written. Author is requested to remove similar terms such as the use of "actual and perceived" differences by individuals has been the cause of war in many societies. Many grammatical issues. To improve used scientific terms such as type of study (exploratory).

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

There are excessive grammatical errors throughout the paper such as ending sentences with more than one punctuation. Ex: for?. Placing periods before citations and not following which is required in APA.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The paper use of nine sections is many and recommended to be reduced for clarity. Author is encouraged to explain the type of research design since using two modes: literature review and qualitative.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The body of the paper is unclear. There is a need to clarify and shorten headings such as: 3.2 The source of reparation and who should provide it? Any legal provision and 4.3 Domestic framework and 9 Suggestions or way forward (possibly use only Suggestions or Recommendations for Further Study).

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Acceptable.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

APA has not been followed for in text citations and references. Footnotes were used.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2

- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The author is to be commended on researching a needed topic. While the research design, grammar and use of APA are all in need or major revision, the paper is invited to revise and resubmit to improve the clarity, format/organization (i.e. reduction of the 9 sections) and writing (i.e. periods are placed following not before citations, no use of periods and question marks at end of the sentence (punctuations) and use of correct APA 7th edition (in text citation, references).

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. HAN Hettiarachchi	
University/Country: Sri Lanka	
Date Manuscript Received: 15.03.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 23.03.2021
Manuscript Title: Kidnapped and Made Brides: Advancing Quantum Reparation for Sexual and Gender-based Victims in Conflict Zones	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 60.12.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	04
This research paper reflects a sound information related to the topic and it is well articulated with the topic of the manuscript. But, it provides an essay type analysis. To avoid this nature, it is recommended to use some table/s, figures rather than using a mere descriptive sentences.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	02
It is recommended to reduce the descriptive sentences in the abstract and insert few sentences about the methodology applied in the research.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	04
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	03
Necessary to elaborate the methodology precisely along with the specific research techniques employed.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	03
Refer the comments given in section one and employ a suitable method/s to present data which can be used to avoid the essay type monotony.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	03
Conclusion should slightly alter in accordance with the changes made to meet the comments in section 01 and 05.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	04
Please refer the guideline of ESJ and correct the minor mistakes in the list of reference and the in text citations.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Kindly refer all the comments given in relevant places