

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56951

Title: Peace Education as an Ethical Foundation for Sustainable and Conflict-Free Schooling

Recommendation:

Accept after major revision.

The manuscript has strong potential and high relevance, but substantial improvements are required in clarity, structure, academic rigor, and language quality before it is suitable for publication.

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity			✓	
Significance		✓		

Reviewer's ID: JPR- Lastri Wahyuni Manurung

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Abstract

- **Line 6–8:** Sentence is too long and overloaded with concepts. Consider splitting for clarity.
- **Line 14–16:** “The paper further integrates policy recommendations...” → unclear how (methodologically). Clarify approach.

Introduction / Rationale Section

- **Line 37:** “pedagogical practiceaimed” → missing space (“practice aimed”).
- **Line 43–44:** Repetition of citation (*Salomon & Nevo, 2005*) without added value. Reduce redundancy.
- **Line 45–46:** Sentence structure unclear: “challenge systemic forms of violence, social, structural, and institutional” → revise for clarity.
- **Line 48:** “transformative actthat shapes” → missing space (“act that shapes”).
- **Line 54:** “education,each contributing” → missing space.
- **Line 58:** “Akudolu&Umenyi” → missing space after “Akudolu”.
- **Line 63–64:** “civil behavior” → consider consistent British or American spelling (behaviour vs behavior).
- **Line 66–68:** Argument about criticism is underdeveloped; needs supporting evidence or elaboration.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Conceptual Framework Section

- **Line 84:** “educationwhen integrated” → missing space.
- **Line 88:** “educationnone” → missing space.
- **Line 96–98:** Run-on sentence. Needs punctuation or splitting.
- **Line 100:** “anti- bullying” → incorrect spacing (should be “anti-bullying”).
- **Line 109–113:** Good idea but lacks critical explanation of *how* synergy works.

Theoretical Foundations

- **Line 130–135:** Strong theoretical reference, but lacks critical comparison between theories.
- **Line 137:** “whole personemotionally” → missing space.
- **Line 143–148:** Good explanation, but needs empirical support or examples.
- **Line 157:** “approachessuch as” → missing space.

Ethical & Philosophical Foundations

- **Line 170–173:** Well-written, but overly descriptive; add critical insight.
- **Line 177–178:** “Gandhian Philosophyemphasises” → missing space.
- **Line 183–184:** Ubuntu quote needs citation formatting consistency.

Holistic Approaches Section

- **Line 235:** “classroom wallsinto” → missing space.
- **Line 242:** Citation (*Yu et al., 2024*) is very recent—ensure consistency with referencing style.
- **Line 256–259:** Good argument, but lacks concrete example or case study.
- **Line 261–264:** Sentence too long; improve readability.

Implementation Section (Table)

- Table formatting is inconsistent and difficult to read.
- Column alignment and headings should be standardized.
- Consider converting into a clearer structured table format.

Policy Recommendations Section

- **Line 313:** “toolsranging” → missing space.
- **Line 315:** “teachers leadclassroom integration” → missing space.
- Content is strong but repetitive of earlier sections.
- Needs synthesis rather than restatement.

Conclusion

- **Line 326–327:** “traditionsfrom Freire’s” → missing space.
- Conclusion is comprehensive but **too long**.
- Should be more concise and highlight:
 - Key findings
 - Contribution
 - Future research directions

REVIEWER'S REPORT

References

- Multiple formatting inconsistencies:
 - ➔ Missing spaces (e.g., "&Niens")
 - ➔ Inconsistent DOI formatting
 - ➔ Mixed citation styles
- Some references lack proper journal formatting (e.g., volume/issue/pages).

Major Issues to Address:

1. **Lack of Methodology**
 - ➔ The paper reads as conceptual but does not explicitly state:
 - Research design
 - Approach (literature review? conceptual analysis?)
 - ➔ This must be clarified.
2. **Language and Editing**
 - ➔ Frequent spacing and typographical errors throughout the manuscript.
 - ➔ Requires professional proofreading.
3. **Critical Depth**
 - ➔ The manuscript is largely descriptive.
 - ➔ Needs more:
 - Critical analysis
 - Comparison of perspectives
 - Evaluation of limitations
4. **Redundancy**
 - Several ideas are repeated across sections (e.g., peace education + sustainability link).

Minor Issues:

- Improve transitions between sections.
- Ensure consistency in terminology (e.g., ESD, SDGs).
- Reduce overly long sentences.
- Standardize formatting (headings, bullet points, tables).