

Paper: “Challenges of Dispute Settlement through International Court of Justice (ICJ): the Case of Ukraine v. Russian Federation the Decision on Provisional Measures on Alleged Violation of Genocide Convention”

Submitted: 12 July 2022

Accepted: 25 September 2022

Published: 30 September 2022

Corresponding Author: Bezabh Abebe Bahiru

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n29p64

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Robert N. Diotalevi
Florida Gulf Coast University, USA

Reviewer 2: Habib Kazzi
Lebanese University, Lebanon

Reviewer 3: Giuseppe Cataldi
University of Naples “L’Orientale”, Italy

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title is in adequacy with the content of the article and the conclusion of the author.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is quite comprehensive. But the author should focus more on the results and less on the challenges.

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

There are some minor spelling mistakes that may be corrected by a mere rereading of the text.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

the study applied a qualitative approach that uses both primary and secondary sources as references to analyze research findings and the research tends to utilize a case analysis approach. Also, the article is divided into four parts clearly identified.

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

The content of the study is clear as a whole. The four parts are clearly identified with properly ordered arguments.

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

The conclusion is well structured on two pillars: summary of institutional and substantial challenges faced by the ICJ, along with a set of recommendations.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are diverse and recent.
However, the author should classify them as per a clear parameter (alphabetical or chronological).

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper is relevant from a scientific and academic perspective.

However, I strongly recommend the author to focus on the following two points before any publication:

- redrafting the abstract so as to highlight clearly his conclusions and recommendations
- classifying the list of references as per a clear parameter (alphabetical or chronological).

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Decline Submission

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

Yes, maybe too long but it clearly shows which will be the issue dealt with

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Not in a satisfactory manner, as it should be better written in an acceptable English language and, moreover, with a better division into different sentences divided by a full stop

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

Yes, there are too many, all over the article

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Not completely. There is confusion in the different parts as the author begins with a general description of the UN judicial system and its history (maybe too long) but then it comes back to it even afterwards, where the discussion should be concentrated only on the case at issue.

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

Yes, it is more or less clear notwithstanding the mistakes in the language used. The problem is that the scheme is not logical and consequential and many statements, especially at the beginning and end, appear very naive

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

The Conclusion is naive or it reiterates trite and obvious statements

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes it is

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please try to reorganize the Paper with a better schematic succession of topics. The first part, the general one on the UN Judicial system, should be synthesised. The central part, on the case at issue, after a description of the case, should be incentrated on the comment of the different parts of the decision (and on the issue of non-appearance beyond the ICJ) without useless or extra information . The Conclusion should avoid comments on the Security Council Membership (which should deserve a much longer discussion) or proposals not supported by an in-depth analysis. The mst important thing: please ask for the help of a English mother tongue reviser.

Reviewer E:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

Yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes

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

Yes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Very fine work!
