

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_92386
Title of the Manuscript:	Political Instability as Root of Armed Conflict in DRC
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	See below to general comments	
Minor REVISION comments	Improve structure of the paper. See below.	
Optional/General comments	<p>Political Instability as Root of Armed Conflict in DRC The topics of this paper are interesting, though well known. The structure and content must be revised, and results have to be better explained by authors before to be reconsidered for publication. Title has to clarify that focuses on Congo and has to avoid acronyms such as DRC but write Democratic Republic of Congo.</p> <p>Abstract has to clarify aim, results and implication for conflict resolution.</p> <p>First, authors have to structure the paper as follows. -Introduction -Study design -Results and discussion -Conclusion</p> <p>Avoiding in the just mentioned sections, sub-headings that create fragmentation of the paper.</p> <p>Introduction has to better clarify the research questions of this study and provide more theoretical background about causes of war and economic development. After that they can focus on the topics of this study to provide a correct analysis for fruitful discussion about social and political issues of DRC (See suggested readings that must be all read and used in the text).</p> <p>Methods of this study is not clear. It has to be created. The section of Materials and methods must clarify if this study is: --A narrative review explains the existing knowledge on a topic based on all the published research available on the topic. --A systematic review searches for the answer to a particular question in the existing scientific literature on a topic. --A meta-analysis compares and combines the findings of previously published studies, usually to assess the effectiveness of an intervention or mode of treatment. Results. the section has to be created.</p> <p>A table has to synthesize the results, though descriptive. Discussion has to show what this study adds and discuss the role of world-systems, underdevelopment and terrorism and armed groups based on growing population in the conflict of DRC.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>Conclusion section has to be created. Conclusion has not to be a summary, but author have to focus on manifold limitations of this study and provide suggestions for conflict resolution and institutional change to support economic and political stability in DRC.</p> <p>Overall, then, the paper is interesting, but structure is confused. Theoretical framework is weak, and some results create confusion... structure of the paper has to be improved; study design, discussion and presentation of results have to be clarified using suggested comments.</p> <p>I strongly suggest revising using all comments. If the paper is improved, by using all comments that I will in-depth verify, maybe it can be considered.</p> <p>Suggested readings of relevant papers that have to be read and all inserted in the text and references.</p> <p>Alexandre, A.B. 2018. Perception of corruption by traffic police and taxi drivers in Bukavu DR Congo: the limits of moral analysis(2018) Journal of Contemporary African Studies, 36(4), pp. 563-574.</p> <p>Coccia M. 2019. Comparative Theories and Causes of War. In: Farazmand A. (ed.) Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5</p> <p>Policing Insecurity Lake, M. 2022 American Political Science Review, 116(3), pp. 858-874</p> <p>Coccia M. 2019. Theories and the reasons for war: a survey. Journal of Economic and Social Thought, vol. 6, n. 2, pp. 115-124. http://dx.doi.org/10.1453/jest.v6i2.1890</p> <p>Namakula, E.B. 2022 Rethinking United Nations peacekeeping responses to resource wars and armed conflicts in Africa: integrating African indigenous knowledge systems, Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research, in press</p> <p>Coccia M. 2018. An introduction to the theories of institutional change, Journal of Economics Library, vol. 5, n. 4, pp. 337-344, http://dx.doi.org/10.1453/jel.v5i4.1788</p> <p>Simpson, F.O., Pellegrini, L. 2022 Conservation, extraction and social contracts at a violent frontier: Evidence from eastern DRC's Itombwe Nature Reserve, Political Geography 92, 102519</p> <p>Coccia M. 2019. Comparative World-Systems Theories. A. Farazmand (ed.), Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance, Springer, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_3705-1</p> <p>Tamm, H. 2022 In the balance: External troop support and rebel fragmentation in the Second Congo War. Journal of Strategic Studies 45(4), pp. 637-664</p> <p>Coccia M. 2018. An introduction to the theories of national and regional economic development, Turkish Economic Review, vol. 5, n. 4, pp. 350-358, http://dx.doi.org/10.1453/ter.v5i4.1794</p> <p>Sidorova, G., Lyubenova, E. 2021. Journal of Asian and African Studies 56(6), pp. 1318-1328</p> <p>Coccia M. 2018. The relation between terrorism and high population growth, Journal of Economics and Political Economy, vol. 5, n. 1, pp. 84-104, http://dx.doi.org/10.1453/jepe.v5i1.1575</p>	
	<p>Robinson, C.D. 2021. A forgotten decade? Politicking and war for the ANC/FAZ 1967-1977 Small Wars and Insurgencies, 32(7), pp. 1117-1137</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mario Coccia
Department, University & Country	Italy