

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56951

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

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

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

Reviewer's ID: JPR- 212

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Overall Assessment:

This paper presents a well-intentioned and broadly conceptual argument for integrating peace education as a foundational ethical framework within sustainable schooling models. The manuscript draws on diverse philosophical traditions (Gandhian, Ubuntu, humanistic), theoretical frameworks (critical pedagogy, conflict transformation), and policy alignments (NEP 2020, SDGs). However, despite its ambitious scope, the paper suffers from several structural, analytical, and methodological weaknesses that require **major revision** before it can be accepted for publication.

Major Concerns Requiring Revision

1. Lack of Original Empirical or Analytical Contribution

The paper reads largely as a narrative literature review rather than a research article. It summarizes existing theories and frameworks but does not present any primary data, case studies, comparative analysis, or original evaluative model. The author(s) should either:

- Reframe the paper as a conceptual or theoretical article with a clear original thesis, or
- Add empirical components (e.g., case studies of schools implementing peace education, survey data from educators, policy analysis).

2. Overly Broad Scope and Shallow Depth

The paper attempts to cover peace education, green technology, conflict resolution, restorative justice, global citizenship, sustainability, and multiple philosophical traditions within a single manuscript. As a result, many sections (e.g., green technology integration, restorative justice practices) remain superficial. **Recommendation:** Narrow the focus to 2–3 core themes (e.g., peace education + restorative justice + NEP 2020) and develop them in greater depth.

3. Weak Methodological Framework

No methodology section is provided. The reader cannot determine how sources were selected, synthesized, or analyzed. For a conceptual paper, a clear statement of the interpretive or philosophical methodology (e.g., hermeneutic analysis, critical synthesis) is necessary. Without this, the paper lacks academic rigor.

4. Redundancy and Structural Overlap

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Several sections repeat similar content (e.g., “Theoretical Foundations” and “Philosophical Underpinnings” overlap significantly; the bullet lists in sections 1–7 under “Defining Sustainable and Conflict-Free Schooling” are repetitive). The paper would benefit from **consolidation and tighter editing**.

5. The Table on Page 9 is Incomplete and Unclear

The table titled “Implementing Peace Education for Conflict Resolution and Sustainability” contains fragmented or missing entries (e.g., empty cells, incomplete rows). The second table on policy recommendations is better but still lacks clear categorization. Both tables need to be **redesigned for clarity, completeness, and logical flow**.

6. Limited Critical Engagement with Counterarguments

The paper acknowledges critics in one short paragraph (page 2) but does not seriously engage with challenges to peace education (e.g., cultural resistance, resource constraints, measurement difficulties, political backlash). A stronger paper would address these systematically and propose mitigations.

7. Citation and Reference Issues

- Some in-text citations are missing from the reference list (e.g., Grund & Brock, 2020; Hughes et al., 2019; Avis, 2020; Burde et al., 2016; Henky, 2014).
- Several DOIs are provided but not consistently formatted.
- The reference list includes 31 items, but many are from 2019–2024; however, seminal works (e.g., Freire, 1970; Lederach) are mentioned in text but not cited formally.

Minor Concerns (to address in revision)

- **Abstract:** Too long (18 lines). Shorten to 150–200 words, focusing on problem, approach, key arguments, and implications.
- **Keywords:** Too many (16). Reduce to 6–8 most distinctive terms.
- **Language and Style:** Generally clear but occasionally redundant (e.g., “peace education is... peace education seeks... peace education advocates...” in succession). Use varied sentence openings.
- **Figures/Images:** The manuscript references media/image1.jpeg and media/image2.png in the header, but these are not present in the provided PDF. Remove or replace.
- **Page numbering:** Inconsistent. Standardize.

Recommendation for Revision

The manuscript has **significant potential** as a conceptual or policy-oriented piece, especially given its alignment with NEP 2020 and SDG 4.7. However, in its current form, it is not publishable. The authors should:

1. Clearly state the **methodology** or conceptual approach.
2. Narrow the scope and deepen analysis on 2–3 key themes.
3. Add **original contribution** (e.g., framework, model, case application, or policy critique).
4. Fix the incomplete table and restructure redundant sections.
5. Complete and correct the reference list.
6. Engage critically with limitations and counterarguments.

After these revisions, the paper would be suitable for reconsideration