



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL  
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Case Study Analysis of Conflict Dynamics in Ukraine, 2022–2027”

**Submitted: 25 May 2026**

**Accepted: 13 June 2026**

**Published: 30 June 2026**

Corresponding Author: Janos Tomolya

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n17p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jorge Wozniak  
National University of Tres de Febrero, Argentina

Reviewer 2: Shaimardanova Z.D.  
Kazak Abylai khan University of International Relations and World Languages, Kazakhstan

Reviewer 3: Chuchu Alebachew  
Amhara Leadership Academy, Ethiopia

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review  
-----

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

The title “Five Years of Full-Scale War in Ukraine: New Realities and Chances for Peace” is timely and globally relevant. However, it does not reflect the manuscript’s stated Mixed Methods research design. Terms such as “New Realities” and “Chances for Peace” are interpretive rather than measurable, and the overall framing is more consistent with Policy Analysis, Discourse Analysis, or Case Study research.

Recommended Revisions:

- Option 1 — Pivot to Qualitative Design (Recommended): e.g., “A Case Study Analysis of Conflict Dynamics in Ukraine, 2022–2027” or “Discourse Analysis of Peace Negotiations: Five Years of War in Ukraine.”
- Option 2 — Secondary Data Analysis framing: if quantitative datasets (UNHCR, World Bank, ACLED) are integrated alongside policy review, this label better accommodates the study’s scope.
- Option 3 — True Mixed Methods title: e.g., “Prospects for Peace After Five Years of War in Ukraine: A Mixed-Methods Analysis of Stakeholder Perceptions and Conflict Indicators.”

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.**

The abstract reads as an analytical essay summary rather than a structured research abstract. Key deficiencies include:

- No stated methodology — readers cannot determine the research approach used.
- Assertive rather than evidence-based claims — geopolitical positions (e.g., the U.S. being “disqualified” as mediator) are stated as facts rather than findings.
- Undefined key terms — concepts such as “constructive ambiguity” and “armed neutrality” require operationalization as analytical categories.
- Normative conclusion — the call for a “new global security architecture” should be presented as a scholarly implication, not an editorial recommendation.
- Inconsistent temporal framing — the distinction between the 2014 onset and the 2022 full-scale escalation lacks academic precision.

Recommended Revision:

Restructure following the Background – Objective – Method – Results – Conclusion sequence. Explicitly state the methodology, present findings objectively, and handle the temporal distinction with precision.

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

The manuscript contains pervasive language and tone issues that significantly undermine its scholarly quality:

- Informal register: second-person address (e.g., “as you can see”) and first-person plural (e.g., “we can rely on”) violate academic writing conventions and must be removed entirely.
- Inconsistent self-referencing: the manuscript alternates between “essay” and “study.” Standardize to “study” or “paper” in formal third-person voice throughout.
- Normative and politically loaded language: statements such as “Russia must be forced to accept this result” and “Russia must never again hold Europe hostage” are advocacy-oriented and empirically ungrounded. All such passages require revision to maintain analytical detachment.
- Unsubstantiated factual claim: the assertion that “the United States is at war with Iran” (Military Stalemate subsection) is abruptly introduced without citation. It must be sourced with a credible reference or removed entirely.

### Recommended Revision:

Conduct a full language audit. Remove all first- and second-person pronouns, standardize self-referencing, revise politically loaded assertions to objective analytical statements, and cite all factual claims.

## **The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

While the manuscript lists credible data sources (ISW, World Bank, UNHCR, KIIS), the Methods section falls substantially short of the transparency required for peer-reviewed publication:

- Missing design classification: the Mixed Methods design type is never named or justified. Authors must explicitly state the design (e.g., Convergent Parallel or Explanatory Sequential) and explain why it suits the research questions.
- Analytical tools not specified: approaches such as “GIS analysis” and “longitudinal macroeconomics” are mentioned without identifying software used (e.g., SPSS, R, NVivo, MAXQDA, ArcGIS).
- No integration procedure: it is not explained how quantitative metrics and qualitative interpretations were combined (e.g., triangulation or joint display) to arrive at the study’s conclusions.
- No Limitations subsection: the manuscript must acknowledge data reliability challenges, particularly regarding OSINT sources, casualty estimates, and the use of intelligence data in an active conflict zone.
- No ethical considerations: a brief note on the ethics of using secondary data concerning displaced persons and conflict casualties is required.

### Recommended Revisions:

- Name and justify the mixed-methods design type explicitly.
- Identify all software used for quantitative and qualitative data processing.
- Describe the integration point — how both data types converge to support conclusions.

- Add a Limitations subsection and a brief ethical considerations note.
- Write the entire section consistently in the past tense with sufficient procedural detail for replication.

**The results are clear and do not contain errors.**

The Results section (Parts I–V) contains substantial structural, analytical, and presentational deficiencies:

- Structural deficiency: the section reads as a series of thematic narratives rather than an empirical presentation of findings. It does not distinguish between quantitative data and qualitative interpretation. Repeated economic figures (GDP loss, defence expenditure) must be consolidated into single, well-cited references.
- Underdeveloped scenario analysis: Part V lists two scenarios without critical evaluation. The selection of only two scenarios is unjustified — alternative outcomes such as decisive military victory are excluded without explanation. The “Korean Peninsula Model” and “Armed Neutrality” are not assessed against enabling vs. challenging factors, nor situated within external think-tank frameworks referenced in the text.
- Missing Discussion section: although the ESJ reviewer checklist does not include a specific Discussion item, the ESJ Author Guidelines (2023) identify it as a mandatory structural component. The manuscript transitions directly from analytical body to Conclusion, entirely omitting this section. The authors are required to add it before resubmission.
- Figure attribution: Figure 1 lacks a formal caption, copyright statement, and verified source attribution.

Recommended Revisions:

- Reorganize into three parts: (1) Quantitative Results — objective metrics with trend analysis; (2) Qualitative Results — thematic synthesis from discourse and policy documents; (3) Integration — a Joint Display showing convergence of both data types.
- Justify the two-scenario selection and assess enabling vs. challenging factors for each.
- Integrate external think-tank research referenced in the introduction.
- Add a dedicated Discussion section interpreting findings against Neo-realist IR theory and Conflict Resolution theory, situating results within existing literature, addressing implications, and articulating the study’s theoretical contribution.
- Add a formal caption and source attribution to Figure 1.

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

Strength: The two-scenario framework (“Korean Peninsula Model” and “Armed Neutrality”) is a meaningful conceptual contribution with coherent linkage across military, political, and diplomatic dimensions. The authors should retain and build on this strength.

The following issues must be addressed:

- Normative language: statements such as “Russia must be forced to accept this result through

political, economic, and military pressure” are politically charged and insufficiently grounded in evidence.

- New unsubstantiated arguments: claims regarding necessary changes to U.S. security policy and “neo-imperialist behavior” are introduced without prior development in the manuscript body. Conclusions must synthesize established findings only.
- Excessive length and repetition: ideas on attrition warfare, geopolitical realignment, and security guarantees are unnecessarily repeated. The section requires significant condensation.
- Weak methodological integration: the conclusion does not demonstrate how quantitative trends and qualitative interpretations converge, nor does it articulate the study’s theoretical contribution to IR, conflict studies, or peacebuilding scholarship.

#### Recommended Revisions:

Retain the scenario framework as the core contribution. Neutralize politically loaded language, remove new unsupported arguments, consolidate repetitive content, and close with a concise evidence-based synthesis that explicitly states the study’s scholarly contribution.

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

Strength: The reference list is extensive, current (2024–2026), and draws on a credible range of peer-reviewed journals, think-tank reports, and international organizations.

The following technical deficiencies must be corrected:

- Inconsistent referencing style: the list blends APA, Chicago, and informal web-citation formats. All references must be standardized to APA format as required by ESJ guidelines.
- APA formatting errors: irregular author formatting, inconsistent date placement, missing publication details (volume, issue, DOI), use of dashes instead of hanging indentations, failure to maintain strict alphabetical order, and inappropriate use of “Downloaded from” instead of a proper URL/DOI.
- In-text citation errors: citations vary in format and do not consistently follow the required “Author(s), Year” style. A likely typographical error cites “CSIS, 2016” for events occurring in 2026.
- Incomplete and missing entries: the entry “(B., M., Snegovaya, M...)” contains an incomplete first author name. The citation “Chotimah, C., 2026” appears in the text but is absent from the reference list.

#### Recommended Revisions:

Conduct a full APA compliance audit. Standardize all entries, complete missing details, cross-check every in-text citation against the reference list, and use reference management software (Zotero, Mendeley, or EndNote) to ensure consistency.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

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

2

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

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

2

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

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

2

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

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

2

*Please rate the RESULTS 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]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s)

The detailed section-by-section comments above constitute the full set of recommendations. In summary, the manuscript will be significantly strengthened by addressing the following in order of priority:

- Priority 1: Add a dedicated Discussion section as required by ESJ Author Guidelines (2023), interpreting findings against established theoretical frameworks and situating them within existing literature.
- Priority 2: Operationally demonstrate the Mixed Methods design by naming the design type, specifying analytical tools and software, and describing the integration procedure.
- Priority 3: Conduct a full APA compliance audit of all references and in-text citations.
- Priority 4: Revise the academic tone throughout — eliminate informal pronouns, normative assertions, politically loaded language, and inconsistent self-referencing.
- Priority 5: Restructure the title, abstract, and introduction to align with the stated research design and ESJ structural requirements.

The reviewer is willing to evaluate a significantly revised version of this manuscript, provided the authors demonstrate a clear and systematic integration of these recommendations.

-----

-----

Reviewer B:  
Recommendation: See Comments

-----

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

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

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.**

there are no methods in the abstract

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

I didn't notice any grammatical or spelling errors in this article.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

yes

**The results are clear and do not contain errors.**

The article lacks sections like Results and Discussion. There are sections such as “The Milestone of Five Years”? “The New Realities on the Ground” etc.

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

The Conclusion is accurate and supported by the content.

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

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate with new references dating from May 2026

*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]

5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

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

5

*Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.*

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

1

*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):**

Highlight sections : Results, Discussion

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are with the publisher, and the data can be used for research purposes.

*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!*

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Date Manuscript Received: 29-05-2026  | Date Review Report Submitted: 04-06-2026 |
| Manuscript Title: <b>Five years of full-scale war in Ukraine: new realities and chances for peace</b>     |  |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0632/26  |  |
| You agree that your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No                                       |  |
| 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><br>[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|--|--|
| <b>1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.</b> | <b>4</b>                                       |

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <b>The title is appropriate, although raising the possibility of peace ignores a central part of the article, which would be reaching an agreement similar to that achieved in the Korean War.</b>   |          |
| <b>2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</b>  | <b>5</b> |
| <b>It proposes a correct synthesis of what is stated in the article</b>  |          |
| <b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>  | <b>3</b> |
| <b>The article is well-written, but on page 4 they state that Russian manufacturing output is projected to grow by a certain percentage in 2025. Given that we are already halfway through 2026, this is a writing error that detracts from the work.<br/>Something similar happens on page 7 when the estimated spending for 2024 and 2025 appears to correspond to a text written during 2023.</b> |          |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>   | <b>5</b> |
| <b>They clarified the methodology they will use. It was suggested that it be expanded in some cases.</b>   |          |
| <b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>   | <b>3</b> |
| <b>There are some errors in interpretation resulting from the partial bibliography they use.</b>   |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>  | <b>3</b> |
| <b>The conclusions are the logical result of the bibliography used.</b>  |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>  | <b>3</b> |
| <b>In some cases, the advisability of incorporating new sources to broaden interpretations or question the conclusions reached based on the bibliography used was noted.</b>   |          |

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed               |          |
| Accepted, minor revision needed            | <b>X</b> |
| Return for major revision and resubmission |          |
| Reject                                     |          |

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

**Since they start from neorealism to analyze the current conflict, it is necessary to be consistent with that starting point throughout the entire exposition and they must apply it to all the actors involved throughout the conflict (Russia and Ukraine, but also the European Union and the USA)**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

=