



Paper: “An Analysis of U.S. Presidential Elections from 2012 to 2024”

Submitted: 08 February 2025

Accepted: 28 February 2025

Published: 28 February 2025

Corresponding Author: Arakaza Dionise

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n560

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: See Comments

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

The title effectively captures the paper's main focus, which analyzes U.S. elections from 2012 to 2024. However, the phrasing could be refined for clarity and natural academic tone. Consider alternatives such as "The Evolution of U.S. Elections from 2012 to 2024" or "An Analysis of U.S. Presidential Elections (2012-2024)" for a more polished presentation.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract offers a broad overview of the elections and their main trends but lacks a clear structure. It does not explicitly outline the methodology used for analysis, making it unclear how the conclusions were reached. The results should be presented more explicitly as key findings or trends rather than merely summarizing events.

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

Though I am not native, I think the paper requires significant language revisions to correct grammatical errors and enhance readability. Professional proofreading is recommended.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The article provides an overview of elections but does not explicitly outline its methodology. The article does not explicitly pose a research question; it may be implicitly suggested (e.g., "How has the U.S. electoral system changed between 2012 and 2024?"). Additionally, the study lacks a clear hypothesis, and the author does not specify the methodological approach used to analyze changes in the electoral system, resulting in an absence of a defined theoretic framework.

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

The article is primarily descriptive, and it remains unclear whether the conclusions are based on statistical analysis, qualitative case studies, or policy reviews. While the findings generally align with established understandings of U.S. elections, some assertions lack sufficient sourcing or in-depth analysis. For example, the statement "The 2016 election demonstrated how extreme political divisions impact elections through populist messaging and Electoral College rules" is broadly valid but should be supported with concrete data or references from political science research. Similarly, the claim that "the 2020 election was the most secure in U.S. voting history" is debatable and requires strong evidence. These aspects should have been examined in greater detail in the body of the paper.

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

The conclusion summarizes key points but is somewhat oversimplified. For instance, while discussing election security, the article does not adequately engage with the significant threats posed by misinformation, cybersecurity risks, and political distrust. Additionally, the section on the impact of political ideologies is too general, lacking direct connections to specific election outcomes.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references cover a broad range of sources, including books, journal articles, and reports. However, some citations seem outdated or secondary.

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]

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]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title, i.e., "Analysis of the Conduct of the USA Elections From 2012 to 2024", is clear and adequate.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is clear, but the sentence "Political shifts between Democrats and Republicans are two major political parties in the United States that receive support from institutional systems that keep the country stable, even with party disagreements," is not consistent. The subject is "Democrats and Republicans" and not "Political shifts." The sentence should be rewritten.

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

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. I suggest the author to perform a proofread of the manuscript.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

A "methodology" section at the end of the manuscript could be worthy.

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

The body of the paper is clear and well-organized.

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

Conclusion section is accurate.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is comprehensive and appropriate.*

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

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, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
