

Paper: **“ *Hamas-Israel War: A Brief Analysis of First Two Phases of War*”**

**Submitted: 08 February 2024**

**Accepted: 22 April 2024**

**Published: 30 April 2024**

Corresponding Author: Maria Bordas

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n11p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Louis Valentin Mballa  
Autonomous University of San Luis Potosi, Mexico

Reviewer 2: Markella Koutsouradi  
University of the Aegean, Greece

Reviewer 3: Sharad K. Soni  
Jawaharlal Nehru University, India

Reviewer 4: Blinded

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

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

The title is clear

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract should include potential results of the article.

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

The text is well written

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Author must clearly explain the methodological approach of the article.

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

The text is well written. There is a logic in the sequence of ideas.

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

The conclusions are interesting; However, it would be better if the authors emphasized the multidimensional consequences and impacts of the two conflicts.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

References are good

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

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

3

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

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

2

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

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

3

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

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

5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

It is important to explain the method of data collection, the review and analysis of the literature, primary and secondary sources. Furthermore, I suggest reinforcing the argument in the conclusions.

-----

-----

Reviewer B:  
Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

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

The title is clear in the sense that it states a general mission of the paper, but I did not really understand the main point that the article tries to make.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract is very clear, in the sense that it points out what the paper has to show. However, the missions of understanding the background for the October 7, 2023 attack, the Israeli failure, and then a review of the first phases of the war - these are far too wide for an article, I doubt it if an entire book can cope with such a scope of issues.

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

The paper certainly needs English linguistic editing. From the very first sentence [with "Middle East" instead of "the Middle East"] and then throughout the whole essay. However, this remark should be taken with a grain of salt since I myself am not an English speaker.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

There are no research methods whatsoever!

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

The paper contains several errors -

1. The assumption that the war was between the IDF and Iran. If this evaluation is based - it has to be properly established.
2. Ariel Sharon's visit to the Temple Mount was no more provocative than the visit of millions of Muslims to the site throughout decades. Rather, there are quite a few research papers that point out that the 2000 Second Intifada started rather with the collapse of Clinton's Camp David Summit.
3. The paper describes a ceasefire that collapsed between Israel and the Hamas. However, the ceasefire was temporal from its essence, and was supposed to last only as long as Israeli hostages were being released. The moment the process was stopped

by Hamas - the arrangement automatically came to its end.

4. The short summary of the 1948 military campaign fails to touch the most important events, particularly - the creation of the refugee problem, a very crucial point when one wishes to decipher the motivations of Hamas!

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

The tight connection between the conclusion and the body of the paper is that too many issues are dealt with in one essay and the result is lack of focus on a specific idea.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

1. There are only 6 or 7 academic references. The rest are taken from newspapers and TV channels.

2. The name is Benny Morris, not the way it is written in the text and in the reference list.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

*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]

1

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The basic fault of the writer is that a paper should refer to one issue, and that issue has to be deeply inquired. I would skip the description of the various phases of the war, which is a technical subject, and refer to just one point. You may choose the reasons for the Israeli failure to anticipate the Hamas attack, but in this case you should also take into account the decades-long Israeli doctrine concerning the relations with the Palestinians.

-----

-----

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: See Comments

-----

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

Although the title is clear and adequate to the content of the article, it needs to be rephrased.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Although the abstract presents objects, it lacks the methods and results.

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

There are some spelling mistakes which need to be rectified.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The study methods have not been explained, so there is a need to add a separate section after Introduction.

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

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

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

The conclusion appears to be accurate and supported by the content.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The article lacks in-text citation which should be done as per the policy of ESJ.

*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]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

*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]

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The manuscript demonstrates a good piece of research work with adequate outcomes. Such efforts demonstrate seriousness on the part of the author to deal with the research problem undertaken. However, it needs minor revision as suggested to fit into the ESJ norms: (1) Title should be rephrased as " Hamas-Israel War: A Brief Analysis of First Two Phases of War"; (2) Although the abstract presents objects, it lacks the methods and results which need to be added to the manuscript; (3) There are a few spelling mistakes which need to be rectified; (4) The study methods have not been explained, so there is a need to add a separate section of Methods after



Introduction; (5) The manuscript lacks in-text citation which should be done as per the policy of ESJ. After this minor revision the manuscript is worth publishing for the benefit of the larger community of researchers, scholars and policy planners.

-----  
-----  
Reviewer E:  
Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

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

The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract is sufficient but needs amendments regarding syntax and grammar mistakes

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

Meticulous proofreading needed.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

There is no clear methodology provided.

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

Although the paper is clear, it needs an academic approach in order to incorporate a further critical discussion.

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

The conclusions are pretty clear.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Major amendments needed in the citations and the reference list.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

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

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*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!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

-----

-----

Reviewer F:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

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

The title is clear and adequate

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

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

I do not notice major grammatical errors.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Methods are not reported. Perhaps, it could be worthy to add a small paragraph.

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

The body of the paper is clear and without errors.

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

Conclusion is accurate and clear.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Bibliography is comprehensive.

*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):**

The manuscript is a high quality work.

-----