EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute
15 YEARS

Paper: **"The U.S.-Iraq War's Legacy in Global Terrorism and the Taliban's Return to Power"**

Submitted: 01 August 2025
Accepted: 08 October 2025
Published: 31 October 2025

Corresponding Author: Tamuna Sadaghashvili

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n29p161

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jozsef Zoltan Malik
Budapest Metropolitan University, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Louis Valentin Mballa
Autonomous University of San Luis Potosi, Mexico

Reviewer 3: Fathi Zerari
Souk-Ahras University, Algeria

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025*
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: Prof. Fathi ZERARI	
University/Country: Souk-Ahras university, Algeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 2O/08/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/08/2025
Manuscript Title: **The U.S.-Iraq War's Legacy in Global Terrorism and the Taliban's Return to Power**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 38.08.2025	
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.

Questions	***Rating Result*** [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	
The title is clear and adequate to the content. 5/5	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	
Yes, the abstract presents objects, methods and results. 4/5	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
As much as I am aware, I have not noticed any grammatical errors or spelling mistakes. 5/5	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
Yes, I guess the author gave a robust explanation of the analysis, using historical analysis, comparative case study, and thematic analysis. 4/5	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	

The author made a good case about the link between US-Iraq war and the rise of extremism. 4/5	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
I guess the conclusion is cogent and opens the door to further researches about the outcomes of wars or military interventions, particularly the unintended rise of extremism. 4/5	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
I think that there is no problem with the references on the contrary, they support well the content, save a minor typo about one reference which is to be corrected: Lynch, M. **(2012)**. *The Arab Uprising: The Unfinished Revolutions of the New Middle East.*	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Though the piece is not a full length article, the author is a very promising researcher; they made a strong case about the 2003 US-Iraq War enhanced extremism, using appropriate methods and relevant references to ground the case.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: See Comments

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title accurately reflects the manuscript's main topics and time frame, effectively capturing the connection between the two key phenomena under examination.
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract clearly summarizes the aims, the main methodological approach, and the key findings. However, the methodological element is rather brief; the thematic content analysis and the case-study element could be given greater emphasis.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
The language is generally clear and academic, though a few minor typos and formatting inconsistencies are present.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
The methods section effectively describes the types of sources used, the main coded themes, the process of manual coding, and the criteria for source selection. The case-study style analysis situates the document analysis in context, enriching the interpretation. Nevertheless, the methodological description is more of an overview and falls short of the level of detail generally expected in qualitative research. It does not include precise code definitions that would specify what content elements are encompassed within each thematic category, nor does it indicate what coding units the author used (sentence, paragraph, or text segment). Concrete text excerpts or quotations illustrating how a source passage relates to the assigned code are highly recommended. And there is no information on whether the coding was carried out by a single researcher or multiple coders, nor whether intercoder agreement checks were performed to enhance reliability. (The statement "Data coding was performed manually, involving cross-referencing multiple sources to ensure accuracy and consistency" is not complete from a methodological point of view.)
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The results are coherent, logically structured, and well connected to the methodology. The case-study component illustrates the main theses of the analysis through concrete geopolitical events.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The conclusions align with the findings and the research objectives. It would be beneficial to elaborate more on the policy recommendations and practical implications.
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
The reference list is extensive and relevant, but the formatting is inconsistent in places, and more recent sources from 2023–2024 could be integrated.
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]
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's strengths lie in its well-chosen and extensive source base for the thematic content analysis and the case-study approach, which provides deeper context for the analysis. It is recommended to expand the methodological section with precise definitions of codes, examples, and a clear explanation of coding units, as well as to integrate the most recent relevant literature. In the conclusions, more detailed policy recommendations would strengthen the practical contribution of the study.

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The tittle of the article is clear, but do not reflect the content of the manuscript
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract doesn't follow thew the guidelines of ESJ to be a brief presentation of the aims and scope, methods, findings

and conclusion of the article. it's very confuse and also, no alined to the format requiered by the ESJ.

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

It's ok

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodological framework is very confusing. Although it is mentioned that the approach is qualitative, there is no clear logical sequence that determines the methodological path.

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

Although the article tends to follow the suggested ESJ template guidelines, there is a noticeable deficiency in terms of argumentation, as well as a lack of clear definition and determination of the manuscript's analytical variables.

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

The conclusions appear to be the most interesting part of the article; the author is asked to reflect the arguments of the conclusions within the main body of the text

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The sources seem rather weak due to the large number of primary and secondary sources available on the US–Iraq conflict. The author is requested to incorporate more up-to-date sources.

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]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

3

Overall Recommendation!!!
Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
recommend strengthening the argumentation of the article, ensuring that it is reflected in the introduction, objectives, hypotheses, and methodological path. Furthermore, the article lacks a solid theoretical and conceptual foundation. The author should follow the editorial criteria of ESJ in drafting the abstract. The argumentation should also be reinforced with more academic sources.

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title is clear and adequate to the content 5/5
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
Yes, the abstract presents objects, methods and results. 4/5
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
As much as I am aware, I have not noticed any grammatical errors or spelling mistakes. 5/5
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
Yes, I guess the author gave a robust explanation of the analysis, using historical analysis, comparative case study, and thematic analysis. 4/5
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
As far as I am aware, the body is well structured and does not contain errors worth to be mentioned. 4/5
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
I guess the conclusion is cogent and opens the door to further researches about the outcomes of wars or military interventions, particularly the unintended rise of extremism. 4/5
The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.
I think that there is no problem with the references on the contrary, they support well the content, save a minor typo about one reference which is to be corrected: Lynch, M. (2012). The Arab Uprising: The Unfinished Revolutions of the New Middle East.
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]
4

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 author is very promisiing. The piece is a good one and worth to be published in your esteemed journal.
