

# Review of: "The Failure of Diplomatic Mediations in the Syrian Conflict – A Comparative Analysis"

Serge Banyongen<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Ottawa

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The article is fascinating and insightful. It has a triple component:

- Descriptive, with a detailed menu showing the main components of the three mediations. We can thus follow them from their genesis to the ultimate stage of their failure. This part also deconstructs the structure of the conflict, from the movement phase of political demands to the armed and violent phase.
- Analytical: this part explains why the mediations failed, following their articulation on the basis of Zartman's theoretical concepts.
- Comparative: in this segment, the article compares the mediations. First, the LAS and UN mediations, and then the two UN mediations.

In this context, this article contributes to the advancement of knowledge in the field of peace-building, negotiation, and mediation. I therefore recommend its publication.

That said, some limitations need to be fixed prior to publication. As it currently stands, this article doesn't have a methodology section. It is difficult to impossible to know how the information presented was collected. Research methodology is essential for ensuring that the results obtained are valid and reliable. It defines the research framework and ensures the data collected is relevant and complete. Based on the information, I'm guessing your article is a result of document analysis that has allowed you to gather informative data by studying officials' documents. If that is the case, this clearly needs to be said and explained what documents were used and why them and not others.

Also, your theoretical framework heavily relied on the five basic challenges of mediation from Zartman et al., 2016). This is great, but it would have been useful to introduce others such as Ury et al., 1988 briefly; Rubin et al., 1994; Henderson et al., 1996; Carrell & Hearvin, 2008; Craver, 2012; Druckman & Olekans, 2013 to just name a few and many others. Once that is done, you can explain why you are only using Zartman et al, 2016 and why their approach is more adapted to the conflict than others.

Lastly, I would advise having a fourth annex in the form of a table summarizing and breaking the main differences between the mediations.

Thanks

