

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

Miroslav Plundrich<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of West Bohemia

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

First of all, I briefly formulate the review in a few points below (followed by my text of recommendations):

| <b>A. Content analysis</b> (indicate <b>X</b> in your answer):                                   | <b>Yes</b> | <b>Partly</b> | <b>No</b> |
|--|------------|---------------|-----------|
| 1. Is the title of the article consistent with its content focus?                                | x          |               |           |
| 2. Does the abstract express the main ideas of the article?                                      |            | x             |           |
| 3. Does the article display the character of a scientific text?                                  |            | x             |           |
| 4. Does the article have a sophisticated methodological structure?                               |            |               | x         |
| 5. Is the content logical and consistent in terms of theoretical approach and comprehensibility? |            |               | x         |
| 6. Do you propose any text editing (abridgement, supplementation, etc.)?                         | x          |               |           |
| 7. Does the used scholarly literature address the issue solved?                                  | x          |               |           |
| 8. Is the article original and scientifically beneficial?  |            | x             |           |

| <b>B. Formal analysis</b> (indicate <b>X</b> in your answer):                            | <b>Yes</b> | <b>Partly</b> | <b>No</b> |
|--|------------|---------------|-----------|
| 9. Does the article contain appropriate linguistic and stylistic level?                  |            | x             |           |
| 10. Is the citation and paraphrasing correctly marked in the article?                    | x          |               |           |
| 11. Does the article show logical consistency and distinctly delimited individual parts? |            |               | x         |

## C. Recommendations and comments:

The author opens Pandora's box of the Syrian conflict and international mediation tendencies. The aim (I guess from the abstract) is to compare LAS and two UN missions. Such a goal is understandable and needed.

However, since I started reading, I have had several questions. I am perplexed by the structure and logic of the presented text. The main problem is also the lack of a research question. I could not find it.

I have no idea why the author did the unwieldy structure.

Introduction --> background --> overview --> once again overview... etc.

I advise you to do the following:

I. Introduction (background of the Syrian conflict and first attempts of mediation)

and the reason to do such research with proper RESEARCH QUESTION

II. Theoretical framework - used operational dataset /concepts etc.

(it is also good to use more authors of concepts than "only" Zartman.)

III. Application and analyses of LAS / UN mission

IV. Conclusion --> some table of comparison and lessons learned.

For my review, I can use three words:

"Specify, target, narrow"

Then I believe it will be different article with better use.