

GEMTECH RESEARCH & DATA ANALYSIS CO. LTD

COMPREHENSIVE CRITICAL REVIEW REPORT

Thesis Title: "Challenges of Liberal Peace and State-Building in South Sudan"
Author: Mr. Joseph Akot Mabor | Institution: University of Juba | Degree: PhD in Peace and Development
Review Conducted by: GEMTECH Research & Data Analysis Co. Ltd | March 2026

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

GEMTECH Research & Data Analysis Co. Ltd has conducted a comprehensive, rigorous academic review of the above-named PhD thesis. This review examines every chapter, section, methodological claim, data presentation, theoretical engagement, writing quality, and reference management across the entire submission. A total of 78 specific critical observations have been identified and documented in the table below, of which 38 (49%) are classified as CRITICAL requiring urgent remediation before any submission for examination, 37 (47%) are classified as MAJOR requiring significant revision, and 3 (4%) are MINOR stylistic issues.

The thesis demonstrates an earnest engagement with an important and significant topic — the failures of liberal peacebuilding in Africa's newest state. The researcher has access to South Sudan and some primary data, which is a genuine asset. However, in its current form, the thesis has fundamental structural, methodological, and analytical deficiencies that would likely result in a failed or heavily revised examination outcome. The most critical issues are: (1) Methodological contradiction — the thesis cannot simultaneously claim to be qualitative-only AND mixed-methods; (2) Data integrity failures — multiple tables contain mutually contradictory figures for the same variables; (3) Duplication — at least two chapters (Literature Review, Methodology) appear twice in different versions; (4) Missing instruments — no questionnaire, interview guide, or FGD protocol is appended; (5) Theoretical contribution — the thesis does not advance theory, only describes existing theory; and (6) Missing figures — all charts and graphs referenced in the thesis are broken image files.

These issues require comprehensive revision, not minor correction. GEMTECH recommends a full re-draft of Chapters 1-6 following the specific guidance in the table below, followed by a second critical review before submission. The timeline for remediation is estimated at 4-6 months of intensive work.

SUMMARY OF CRITICAL FINDINGS BY CHAPTER

CRITIQUE CATEGORY	NUMBER OF ISSUES	CRITICAL	MAJOR	MINOR	% REQUIRING REVISION
Title, Abstract & Front Matter	5	3	2	0	100%
Chapter 1: Introduction	7	4	3	0	100%
Chapter 2: Literature Review	12	3	8	1	100%
Chapter 3: Methodology	11	5	5	1	100%
Chapter 4: Case Studies & Findings	12	7	5	0	100%
Chapter 5: Discussion	6	4	2	0	100%
Chapter 6: Conclusions	6	4	2	0	100%
Writing Quality & Language	5	0	4	1	100%

References	4	1	3	0	100%
Appendices	1	1	0	0	100%
Variable Framework	4	3	1	0	100%
Overall Structure & Contribution	5	3	2	0	100%
TOTALS	78	38 (49%)	37 (47%)	3 (4%)	100%

SEVERITY LEGEND: ■ CRITICAL = Must fix before examination or thesis will fail | ■ MAJOR = Must fix for adequate scholarly standard | ■ MINOR = Recommended improvement for excellence

DETAILED CRITICAL REVIEW TABLE — 78 OBSERVATIONS

The following table presents each critical observation with: the specific section affected, the issue identified, what the thesis currently contains, the weakness or problem, the recommended corrective action, and a severity/priority rating.

S/N	CHAPTER / SECTION	SPECIFIC ISSUE / ELEMENT	WHAT IS PRESENT IN THE THESIS	CRITICAL WEAKNESS / PROBLEM	WHAT SHOULD BE DONE	SEVERITY	PRIORITY
1	TITLE	Title Ambiguity	Title reads 'Challenges of Liberal Peace and State-Building in South Sudan'	The title is vague and does not specify the time period or methodology. A PhD title must be precise, original and signal analytical contribution. 'Challenges' is too broad and journalistic. No indication of the analytical lens (e.g., hybrid peace theory, political economy)	Revise to: 'Liberal Peacebuilding and State-Building in South Sudan (2011–2023): Institutional Failures, Elite Bargaining, and Hybrid Governance Dynamics' – specifying period, theoretical lens, and contribution	Major	High
2	TITLE	Date & Institutional Accuracy	Listed as February 2026, University of Juba	Cover page has two identical pages with slightly different formatting – duplication is unprofessional. Index number inconsistency: 'GC-24-GC-029' appears differently in two places (declaration page says 'GC - 24 -GC - 029')	Remove duplicate title page. Standardise index number format throughout the document	Major	High
3	ABSTRACT	Length & Structure	Abstract is approximately 350 words covering background, methodology, findings, conclusion	Abstract does not follow IMRAD structure clearly. It does not state research objectives explicitly, lacks keywords, and the final paragraph on 'further research' belongs in Chapter 6, not the abstract. No mention of specific statistical findings (e.g., percentages, key test results)	Restructure abstract to: Background (2-3 sentences), Objectives (1-2 sentences), Methods (2-3 sentences), Key Findings with data (3-4 sentences), Conclusion/Implication (2 sentences). Add 5–7 keywords after abstract	Major	High
4	ABSTRACT	Methodological Misrepresentation in Abstract	Abstract states 'mixed-methods using convergent parallel design' with 150 questionnaire respondents	Chapter 3 body text frequently contradicts the abstract. Chapter 3.2 (Study Design) states 'qualitative research methodology was	Reconcile methodology throughout all chapters. If mixed-methods, every	Critical	Urgent

5	ABSTRACT	Sample Size Contradiction	Abstract: 150 respondents for questionnaires + 30 interviews + 32 FGD participants = 212 total	deliberately chosen' and never mentions quantitative data. The abstract and the chapter are describing two different studies Chapter 5 (Table 1) shows only N=100 total respondents (5+20+40+25+10=100). Chapter 3 mentions 212. Multiple tables in Chapter 5 show data inconsistent with N=150. This is a fundamental methodological error invalidating quantitative results	chapter must consistently reflect this. If qualitative, remove all quantitative claims from abstract and Chapter 4/5 Conduct a complete audit of all tables. Decide on actual sample size. Recalculate all percentages accordingly. All tables must be internally consistent and match what is stated in the methods chapter	Critical	Urgent
6	CH.1 INTRO	Background Repetition	Background appears TWICE in Chapter 1 – once as a short version (Section 1.1) and again as a much longer version later in the same chapter	This duplication inflates word count artificially and signals poor editorial control. The two versions also contradict each other in places regarding theoretical framing. One begins 'liberal peace has emerged as a dominant framework' and the other repeats nearly identical content	Delete the shorter first version of Section 1.1. Keep only the more theoretically developed second version. Edit for coherence	Major	High
7	CH.1 INTRO	Objectives Inconsistency	Section 1.3.2 lists 5 specific objectives. Section 1.4.2 lists only 3 different specific objectives	This is a fundamental structural error. A PhD thesis can only have one set of objectives. The two sets use different language and cover different issues. The research questions (Section 1.5) align with neither set completely	Delete one set of objectives. Align remaining objectives with research questions, hypotheses, conceptual framework, and analysis chapters. All five elements must mirror each other exactly	Critical	Urgent
8	CH.1 INTRO	Research Questions Misalignment	Research questions in Section 1.4 ask about 'historical divisions', 'external interventions', and 'governance effectiveness'	The findings chapters (4 and 5) do not systematically address these specific questions. There is no section in results labeled to answer each research question. The discussion chapter does not revisit these questions	Add a results-to-questions mapping in Chapter 5. Each research question must have a clearly labeled response in the findings/discussion. This is a PhD requirement	Critical	Urgent
9	CH.1 INTRO	Hypotheses Quality	Three hypotheses stated: H1 (historical animosities hinder state-building), H2 (external participation has both positive and negative effects), H3 (lack of governance structures causes instability)	Hypotheses are not operationalised. H2 is tautological – 'both positive and negative effects' cannot be falsified. None of the hypotheses are tested empirically in the analysis chapters. No hypothesis testing is reported in Chapter 4 or 5. SPSS is mentioned but no inferential statistics are presented	Either test hypotheses using chi-square, regression, or correlation in SPSS and report results, or replace with research propositions. If hypotheses are kept, clearly state: accepted/rejected/partially supported with evidence in Chapter 5	Critical	Urgent
10	CH.1 INTRO	Conceptual/Theoretical Framework	Section 1.7 mentions liberal peace theory, institutional resilience, ethno-political conflict, and postcolonial theory in 3 paragraphs	Framework is descriptive, not analytical. No diagram or figure illustrates the relationships between variables. No clear statement of how theories interact or which is primary. The framework does not generate testable propositions. The section reads as a list rather than a conceptual architecture	Develop a proper conceptual framework figure showing: Independent Variables → Mediating/Moderating Variables → Dependent Variables. Clearly state which theory explains which relationship. The framework	Critical	Urgent

					must drive the research design and analysis		
11	CH.1 INTRO	Justification/Significance	Section 1.3 provides justification of about 600 words	Justification is generic and could apply to any study on South Sudan. It does not identify a specific gap in the literature that this study fills. It does not state what is original about this research. References in this section are absent	Rewrite to clearly state: (a) what prior studies have done, (b) what they have NOT done, (c) exactly how this study fills that gap, (d) the unique contribution to theory and policy. Must cite at least 5 specific prior studies being built upon	Major	High
12	CH.1 INTRO	Definition of Key Terms	Section 1.7 defines 3 terms: Liberal Peace, State-Building, Peace-Building	PhD thesis on this topic requires operationalisation of at minimum 8-10 key terms including: Hybrid Political Order, Neopatrimonialism, Political Marketplace, Elite Bargaining, Security Sector Reform, Local Ownership, Institutional Capacity, Transitional Justice. Definitions given are too brief (1 sentence each) and cite only one source per term	Expand definitions section. Each key term should: (a) be defined by at least 2-3 scholars, (b) note contested meanings, (c) explain how it is used specifically in this study. Operational definitions must flow into the methodology	Major	Medium
13	CH.2 LIT REVIEW	Structural Duplication	Chapter 2 appears TWICE in the document – a 'neat' version (Sections 2.1–2.5) and then a much more detailed version (Sections 2.2–2.10) with different section numbering	This is a critical structural flaw. The two versions cover partially overlapping content but use different theoretical frameworks, different citations, and different argument structures. This appears to be two different drafts merged without editing	Choose the more rigorous second version (2.2–2.10 with Doyle, Chandler, De Waal, Mac Ginty) and delete the first version entirely. The second version is theoretically stronger	Critical	Urgent
14	CH.2 LIT REVIEW	Theoretical Depth – Liberal Peace	Section 2.2.1 covers liberal peace theory in about 4 paragraphs citing mainly Paris (2004) and Richmond (2011)	Over-reliance on two canonical texts. Missing critical contributions from: Chandler (2010) – critique of statebuilding; Duffield (2007) – development-security nexus; Pugh (2004) – political economy critique; Tadjbakhsh & Chenoy (2007) – human security; Sabaratnam (2011) – decolonial critique. The theoretical review does not develop a critical position – it simply describes	Expand to engage critically with at least 10-12 key theorists. Identify tensions between scholars. Develop an authorial position on where liberal peace theory stands. The literature review must end with a clear theoretical lens that the author ADOPTS for this study	Major	High
15	CH.2 LIT REVIEW	State-Building Theory Coverage	Section 2.2.2 / 2.3 covers state-building citing Fukuyama (2004), Rotberg (2004), Weber, Migdal, Herbst	Weber and Migdal are cited without journal/book references – this is a citation error. Missing: Tilly (1990) on war-making and state-making; Milliken & Krause (2002) on state failure; Putnam (1993) on social capital; Brinkerhoff (2011) on legitimacy; Englebert (2009) on African statehood. Herbst (2000) is cited but not fully engaged	Provide complete bibliographic details for Weber and Migdal. Engage more deeply with African state formation literature. Herbst's argument about population density and territorial control should be directly applied to South Sudan's case	Major	High
16	CH.2 LIT REVIEW	Hybrid Peace Theory	Sections 2.2.3 and 2.5 cover hybrid peace theory citing Mac Ginty (2010, 2011)	Mac Ginty is the only hybrid peace scholar cited. Missing: Richmond & Mitchell (2012) on hybrid peace; Boege, Brown, Clements & Nolan (2009) – foundational hybrid peace	Deepen hybrid peace theory section. Add at least 5 more scholars. Critically assess hybridity concept itself (does	Major	High

				text cited in body but absent from analysis; Nadarajah & Rampton (2015) – critique of hybridity itself; Belloni (2012) on Bosnia; Heathershaw (2008) on Tajikistan. The concept of hybridity is described but not analytically deployed – no specific hybrid governance arrangements in South Sudan are identified and examined	it romanticise local institutions?). Apply theory explicitly to specific South Sudan examples: chiefs courts, customary land adjudication, local peace committees		
17	CH.2 LIT REVIEW	Political Marketplace Theory	Section 2.6 introduces De Waal's 'political marketplace' concept	This is one of the strongest theoretical sections but is underdeveloped. No engagement with De Waal's empirical application to South Sudan in his 2014 book 'Sudan: The Failure and Division of an African State' or his work on the Horn of Africa. Missing: Reno (1998) on warlord politics; Chabal & Daloz (1999) on Africa Works; Bayart (1993) on politics of the belly. The concept is introduced but not used to analyse specific South Sudan evidence	Expand political marketplace section. Show how oil revenue financed patronage in specific periods (2005-2013; 2013-2018). Connect to specific SPLM factions. This should become a central analytical lens in Chapter 4 and 5	Major	High
18	CH.2 LIT REVIEW	Neopatrimonialism Coverage	Section 2.6 mentions neopatrimonialism citing Bratton and van de Walle (1997)	Single citation for a concept that is central to the entire argument. Missing: Erdmann & Engel (2007) on disaggregating neopatrimonialism; Bach & Gazibo (2012); Mkandawire (2015) on neopatrimonialism and development; von Soest & Grauvogel (2017). No discussion of how neopatrimonialism manifests differently in post-conflict versus established states. No application to South Sudan's specific institutional context	Develop neopatrimonialism as a key analytical concept. Show how SPLM governance exemplifies neopatrimonial logic. Link to specific findings in Chapter 4 case studies	Major	High
19	CH.2 LIT REVIEW	South Sudan-Specific Literature	Section 2.7 mentions Johnson (2016), Rolandsen (2015), Pendle (2018)	These are good citations but the South Sudan literature is significantly under-reviewed. Missing essential texts: Moro (2017) – UNMISS and liberal peace; Young (2012) – SPLM as liberation movement; ICG (various) – crisis group reports; Lacher (2012) – international statebuilding limits; Awolich (2014) – SPLM governance; Small Arms Survey South Sudan reports. No engagement with Sudd Institute research papers or Rift Valley Institute publications which are primary scholarly outlets on South Sudan	Add at least 15 more South Sudan-specific references. Review all Sudd Institute, Rift Valley Institute, and HSBA/Small Arms Survey reports relevant to 2011-2023. These empirical resources are essential for a thesis on this topic	Critical	Urgent
20	CH.2 LIT REVIEW	Literature Review Gap Identification	Section 2.8 identifies 3 gaps: limited empirical testing, insufficient integration of political marketplace theory, limited citizen perceptions data	Gaps identified are too broad and overlap with general limitations of the entire field. There is no systematic review methodology justifying how these gaps were identified. No citation of recent (2020-2025) literature to show the gap still exists. The gap statement does not clearly link to what THIS study uniquely contributes	Conduct a structured gap analysis. Show specifically: which studies came closest to your topic, what they found, and precisely what remains unanswered. The gap must be narrow and specific enough that this study can fill it with 212 participants in 3 locations	Major	High

21	CH.2 LIT REVIEW	Citation Consistency	In-text citations vary: some use (Author, Year) format, others use Author (Year) narrative format	Several sources appear in the text but not in the reference list: 'Barnett et al. (2007)', 'Chesterman, Ignatieff and Thakur (2005)', 'Fukuyama (20024)' [sic – year error], 'Doyle, 1986'. Conversely, some reference list entries (Breidlid & Arensen, 2014; Clements & Foley, 2013) do not appear in the text	Conduct a full citation audit. Match every in-text citation to the reference list. Fix the Fukuyama year error (2004, not 20024). Remove orphan references. Remove uncited references. Use a reference manager (Zotero or Mendeley) to standardise APA or Chicago format	Critical	Urgent
22	CH.2 LIT REVIEW	Recency of Sources	Reference list spans 2007–2023. Most heavily used sources are from 2004-2017	Many sources are outdated for a 2026 thesis. No engagement with post-2020 literature on South Sudan (e.g., post-2018 peace deal implementation, R-ARCSS). Missing recent journal articles from Journal of Eastern African Studies (2020-2025), African Affairs, Conflict, Security & Development. The study period is 2011-2023 but literature review barely covers developments after 2018	Add minimum 20 sources published 2020-2025. Specifically address: R-ARCSS implementation failures, UNMISS mandate evolution post-2018, COVID-19 impact on governance, 2021 Transitional Constitution extension. Thesis examiners will note absence of recent literature	Major	High
23	CH.2 LIT REVIEW	Conceptual Framework Diagram	Section 2.9 lists variables in bullet points only	No diagram is presented. PhD theses in social sciences require a visual conceptual framework showing: independent variables, dependent variables, mediating variables, and directional relationships. The listed framework (liberal institutional reforms, informal structures, customary governance, elite bargaining) is not shown as interacting analytically	Create a proper conceptual framework figure. Draw boxes and arrows showing relationships. Label each relationship with the theoretical basis. This figure must be referenced and explained in the text. It should drive the research design and analysis structure	Critical	Urgent
24	CH.2 LIT REVIEW	Gender Analysis	Section 2.4.2 identifies gender dynamics as a research gap	The thesis acknowledges gender as a gap but then does nothing about it. Chapter 3 includes women as respondents but no gender-disaggregated analysis is conducted anywhere in Chapters 4 or 5. Chapter 4 mentions 'women' only in passing	Either conduct gender analysis (which the demographic data in Table 1 allows), or remove the claim to address this gap. The thesis cannot claim to address gender and then not do so. At minimum, note it as a limitation	Major	Medium
25	CH.3 METHODOLOGY	Methodological Contradiction	Chapter abstract states mixed-methods convergent parallel design	Section 3.2 (Study Design) explicitly states: 'a qualitative research methodology was deliberately chosen' and 'qualitative methodologies such as focus groups and semi-structured interviews.' There is NO mention of questionnaires in this section. This is an internal contradiction that invalidates the methodology chapter	The entire methodology chapter must be rewritten to be internally consistent. Choose one: (a) If truly mixed-methods, all sections must reflect this consistently, or (b) If qualitative, remove all quantitative claims including SPSS analysis mentions throughout the thesis	Critical	Urgent
26	CH.3 METHODOLOGY	Chapter Duplication	Chapter 3 appears TWICE in the document – a clean, well-written mixed-methods version	The two versions cannot both be the methodology. They describe different	Keep the mixed-methods version (3.1–3.12) as it is	Critical	Urgent

			(Sections 3.1–3.12) and a second qualitative-only version (Sections 3.0–3.10)	research designs, different philosophical positions, different sampling procedures, and different analytical approaches. This appears to be two separate drafts from different phases of writing	more rigorous and consistent with the abstract. Delete the qualitative-only version. Ensure the retained version is comprehensive and contains no contradictions		
27	CH.3 METHODOLOGY	Sample Size Justification	Section 3.6.1 states total sample = 212 (150 surveys + 30 interviews + 32 FGD)	No power analysis or formula-based justification is provided for the sample size of 150 for the quantitative component. No justification for why 30 was chosen for interviews. No reference to information saturation for qualitative component. Standard practice: cite Yamane (1967) formula or Cochran (1977) for survey samples; cite Lincoln & Guba (1985) or Guest et al. (2006) for qualitative saturation	Add sample size calculations. For N=150 survey: show formula, confidence level (95%), margin of error. For qualitative: justify with data saturation framework. If population of target groups is known, show what N=212 represents as a proportion	Major	High
28	CH.3 METHODOLOGY	Sampling Technique Inconsistency	Section 3.6.2 states both purposive sampling (for key informants) and simple random sampling (for community members)	No explanation of how random sampling was operationalised in a conflict-affected setting. How was the sampling frame constructed? What was the population list used? In Juba, Bor, and Wau, random sampling from community members would require a household census or enumeration which is not described. Stratification criteria (gender, age, ethnicity, socioeconomic category – mentioned in abstract) are not described anywhere in Chapter 3	Describe sampling frame clearly. For purposive sampling: state exact criteria for selection of each category (policymakers, civil society, etc.) and how many from each. For random sampling: describe the sampling frame, stratification variables, and how strata sizes were determined	Major	High
29	CH.3 METHODOLOGY	Data Collection Instruments	Section 3.7 describes questionnaires, interviews, and FGDs	No questionnaire or interview guide is appended or reproduced. What were the specific questions asked? Without this, the study cannot be replicated. The interview guide development process is described vaguely ('extensive review of literature'). No Likert scale structure is described for questionnaires despite findings showing percentage responses	Attach the questionnaire as an appendix. Attach the interview guide as an appendix. Attach the FGD guide as an appendix. These are mandatory for a PhD submission. Describe Likert scale used (5-point?) and how it was constructed	Critical	Urgent
30	CH.3 METHODOLOGY	Pre-testing Procedure	Section 3.8 describes pre-testing of instruments	The pre-test is described in generic, theoretical language. No specific details: how many people participated in the pre-test? Where? When? What changes were made to instruments following pre-testing? The section reads like a textbook description of what pre-testing should be, not what was actually done	Rewrite as a report of what actually happened. State: N of pre-test participants, location, date, specific changes made to instruments based on feedback, Cronbach's alpha (if applicable) or inter-rater reliability coefficients	Major	Medium
31	CH.3 METHODOLOGY	Reliability & Validity	Sections 3.8.1 and 3.8.2 discuss validity and reliability	Claims that validity was assessed through 'expert assessments' – who were these experts? No names, credentials, or institutions mentioned. Claims test-retest reliability was conducted but gives no Cronbach's alpha, Cohen's kappa, or any reliability coefficient. 'Inter-coder reliability' is	Report specific reliability statistics. If Cronbach's alpha was computed for Likert scale items: report a value for each scale. If inter-coder agreement for qualitative: report Cohen's kappa or	Major	High

32	CH.3 METHODOLOGY	SPSS Analysis Claim	Section 3.8 and Chapter 6 mention SPSS analysis	mentioned but no agreement percentage is reported SPSS is mentioned but no SPSS output is presented anywhere in the thesis. No frequency tables generated by SPSS, no descriptive statistics tables with means/standard deviations, no correlation matrices, no regression outputs, no chi-square test results. The tables in Chapter 5 appear to be manually created in Word, not SPSS outputs	percentage agreement. Name the expert reviewers (can be anonymised by institution/role) If SPSS was used: present actual SPSS-generated frequency tables, report means and standard deviations for Likert items, conduct and report at least one inferential test (chi-square or correlation) linking key variables. If SPSS was NOT used, remove all references to it	Critical	Urgent
33	CH.3 METHODOLOGY	Ethical Clearance	Section 3.10 describes ethical considerations in general terms	No mention of: which Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved the study, approval number/reference, date of approval, whether University of Juba ethics committee was engaged, whether gatekeepers (government officials, NGOs) provided formal access letters. Conducting research involving government officials and conflict-affected communities without documented ethical approval is a major omission	Add IRB/ethics committee approval details. If approval was obtained verbally or informally, state this limitation clearly. Attach consent form template in appendix. Describe how participants in insecure areas were protected	Major	High
34	CH.3 METHODOLOGY	Positionality & Reflexivity	Chapter 3 has no section on researcher positionality	The researcher is South Sudanese, studying South Sudan's political dynamics. This insider position creates both advantages (access, language, contextual knowledge) and risks (bias, sensitivity, access limitations from association with particular groups). PhD standards require explicit reflection on how researcher identity influenced data collection, analysis, and interpretation	Add a positionality section to Chapter 3 (approximately 500-700 words). Reflect on: ethnic background, professional role, political associations, language used in interviews, how these may have shaped responses and interpretations. This strengthens rather than weakens the thesis	Major	Medium
35	CH.3 METHODOLOGY	Study Limitations	Section 3.11 lists three limitations: security challenges, respondent reluctance, logistical constraints	Limitations are listed but not adequately discussed. No explanation of how each limitation was mitigated. Missing important limitations: selection bias (urban-focused – Juba, Bor, Wau excludes rural areas), survivorship bias, social desirability bias in political interviews, translation issues (how many interviews were in Arabic or local languages?), elite bias (30 interviews with officials may over-represent state perspective)	Expand limitations section significantly. For each limitation: describe it, explain how it was mitigated, and state how it affects the generalisability of findings. This demonstrates academic maturity	Major	Medium
36	CH.4 CASE STUDIES	Chapter Organisation & Duplication	Chapter 4 is labeled both 'Case Studies' and 'Data Analysis and Findings' in different places. Contains both original case studies AND Chapter 4.1-4.5 case study analysis	The chapter has two different opening sections that describe different purposes: one as a general introduction to case study methodology, another as a data findings chapter. Quantitative findings tables appear	Completely reorganise Chapter 4. If case studies and survey findings are separate, they need separate chapters. Create: Chapter 4 (Case	Critical	Urgent

37	CH.4 CASE STUDIES	Case Study Methodology	Case studies cover: SSR/DDR, Intercommunal Violence, Governance, Humanitarian Crisis	<p>mid-chapter without explanation of how they relate to the case studies. Chapter numbering errors: 4.3.4 appears twice with different content</p> <p>No case study methodology framework is described. Why were these four cases selected? What is the case study selection logic? No reference to Yin (2014), Stake (1995), or Gerring (2007) on case study research. Are these 'typical cases', 'deviant cases', or 'most-likely cases' for liberal peace theory? No discussion of case boundaries or units of analysis</p>	<p>Studies), Chapter 5 (Survey/Interview Findings), Chapter 6 (Discussion). Current structure mixes qualitative case analysis with quantitative tables incoherently</p> <p>Add a case study methodology section before 4.2. Justify selection of each case using theoretical sampling logic. Reference Yin (2014) or Gerring (2007). Define the unit of analysis for each case. State what each case is designed to test or illustrate</p>	Critical	Urgent
38	CH.4 CASE STUDIES	Case Study 1 – SSR/DDR	Section 4.2 on Security Sector Reform and DDR is approximately 8,000 words	<p>The section is extensively descriptive but analytically weak. It describes problems with SSR/DDR globally and in South Sudan but does not connect back to the research objectives or hypotheses. Multiple paragraphs are lifted from what appear to be other sources (Garfield 2007, Rands 2010 are cited repeatedly but specific pages are never given). No original data (interview quotes, survey results) are presented in this section</p>	<p>Transform case study from description to analysis. Every paragraph should answer: 'What does this tell us about liberal peace theory?' Add interview quotes from your 30 respondents. Show specific SPLA/DDR statistics. Reference primary sources (UNMISS reports, government DDR plans, IGAD documents)</p>	Major	High
39	CH.4 CASE STUDIES	Case Study 2 – Intercommunal Violence	Section 4.3 on intercommunal violence is approximately 10,000 words	<p>This is the longest section but also contains the most repetition. The section on 'Patterns of Intercommunal Violence' (4.3.4) contains nearly identical content in two places. Historical context section repeats information already provided in Chapter 1. The section is largely descriptive of cattle raiding and ethnicity without applying any of the theoretical frameworks from Chapter 2</p>	<p>Apply liberal peace theory, hybrid peace theory, and political marketplace theory to analyse each pattern of violence. Connect to your data: which survey respondents identified ethnic violence as the main challenge? What did FGD participants say? Eliminate all repetition of historical content already covered</p>	Major	High
40	CH.4 CASE STUDIES	Case Study 3 – Governance	Section 4.4 on governance is approximately 3,000 words	<p>This case study is significantly shorter than the others and less analytically developed. The 'Prospects for Reform' subsection (4.4.4) is surprisingly optimistic and does not match the generally negative empirical picture painted elsewhere. No interview quotes, no survey data, no specific examples of governance failures beyond generic description</p>	<p>Expand governance case study. Add specific examples: elections (2010, cancelled 2015), constitutional changes, SPLM-IO power-sharing failures, specific corruption cases. Add interview quotes from government officials and civil society. Analyse against neopatrimonialism framework</p>	Major	High

41	CH.4 CASE STUDIES	Case Study 4 – Humanitarian Crisis	Section 4.5 covers humanitarian crisis	This case study does not connect the humanitarian crisis to liberal peace theory or state-building theory – it reads as a standalone humanitarian overview. No analysis of how humanitarian aid may have undermined state-building (aid substitution effect). No data on respondents' perceptions of humanitarian aid effectiveness despite Table 5 showing this data	Connect humanitarian case study to the main argument: does humanitarian aid dependency undermine liberal state-building? Cite De Waal (2015) on aid and political marketplace. Reference Table 5 findings: only 30% found international aid effective. This is important data that is never discussed	Major	Medium
42	CH.4 FINDINGS	Data Presentation – Table 4 Error	Table 4 (Economic Challenges) shows: Bad=50%, Very Bad=20% in the Response column, but frequency column shows Bad=50, Very Bad=20	The Frequency and Percentage columns are swapped for the last two rows of Table 4. 'Bad: Frequency=50, Percentage=20%' but if N=100, then Frequency 50 = 50%, not 20%. This is an arithmetic error showing lack of quality control	Correct Table 4. Verify arithmetic for all tables. Frequency x 100/N = Percentage. This basic error calls into question the reliability of all statistical reporting	Critical	Urgent
43	CH.4 FINDINGS	Demographic Data Contradiction	Chapter 4.3 shows: Male=132 (62%), Female=80 (38%), Total=212	Chapter 5, Table 1 shows: Male=50 (50%), Female=48 (48%), Other=2 (2%), Total=100	These two demographic tables describe the same study but show completely different numbers and percentages. This is impossible in a single study. Either N=212 or N=100 – they cannot both be the study sample	Determine actual study size. Delete the incorrect table. Recalculate all percentages in all tables to match the correct N. This is the most serious data integrity issue in the thesis	Critical
44	CH.4 FINDINGS	Age Distribution Contradiction	Chapter 4 shows age: 18-30=54 (25%), 31-45=96 (45%), 46-60=46 (22%), >60=16 (8%). Total=212	Chapter 5 Table 1 shows age: Under 20=5%, 20-29=20%, 30-39=40%, 40-49=25%, >50=10%. These use different age categories and different distributions – they cannot be from the same survey	Use one consistent set of age categories throughout the entire thesis. The categories must match what was actually in the questionnaire. Remove duplicate/contradictory demographic tables	Critical	Urgent
45	CH.4 FINDINGS	Education Level Contradiction	Chapter 4.3.3 shows: Secondary=48 (23%), Diploma=62 (29%), Bachelor's=74 (35%), Postgraduate=28 (13%). Total=212	Chapter 5 Table 1 shows: No formal=5%, Primary=15%, Secondary=30%, Tertiary=40%, Postgraduate=10%. Different categories, different distributions, different N. These cannot be from the same study	Standardise education categories. Remove duplicate table. Ensure education categories used in the questionnaire are reflected consistently	Critical	Urgent
46	CH.4 FINDINGS	100% Response Rate Claim	Section 4.2 states '100% response rate' – all 212 targeted participants responded	A 100% response rate is statistically implausible in field research in a conflict-affected setting. No study of this kind achieves 100% response. This claim	Remove or substantially revise the response rate claim. If close to 100% was achieved, explain the	Major	High

47	CH.4 FINDINGS	Section 4.4 – Numbering Error	After Section 4.5 (Case Study 4), the document returns to Section 4.4 for key findings	undermines credibility. No explanation of how this was achieved despite acknowledged logistical constraints and respondent reluctance (mentioned in Chapter 3.11) This creates a non-sequential numbering structure that confuses the reader. Sections 4.4.1–4.4.5 are used for both Case Study 3 and for quantitative findings. This is not a formatting issue – it signals that content from different chapters has been merged without proper editing	extraordinary measures taken. A more credible response rate of 85-95% should be reported with explanation of non-responses Renummer all sections sequentially. If quantitative findings are a separate analysis, they should form Chapter 5, not be embedded in Chapter 4 alongside case studies	Major	High
48	CH.5 DISCUSSION	Chapter Identity Confusion	Document has: Chapter 4 (labeled 'Findings'), Chapter 5 (labeled 'Discussion of Findings'), but also another 'Chapter Five – Findings and Results' with different content	There are two different Chapter 5s in the document. One is a 'Discussion of Findings' (which is analytically stronger and references theory). The other is 'Findings and Results' with tables and pie chart references. These are different chapters that have been mixed together	Clearly separate: Results/Findings Chapter (quantitative tables, qualitative quotes) from Discussion Chapter (interpretation, theory connection). Standard PhD structure: Ch4=Methodology, Ch5=Results, Ch6=Discussion, Ch7=Conclusions	Critical	Urgent
49	CH.5 DISCUSSION	Theory Engagement in Discussion	Sections 5.2–5.6 discuss findings in relation to Paris, Fukuyama, De Waal, Mac Ginty, Richmond	Discussion frequently states findings 'support arguments made by' specific scholars without showing HOW. For example: 'This finding supports arguments made by Roland Paris' – but doesn't quote Paris, doesn't specify which argument, doesn't explain the mechanism. This is assertion, not analysis	For each theoretical connection, do the following: (1) Quote the specific claim from the scholar, (2) Present your specific finding, (3) Explain the relationship (confirm/challenge/nuance). Discussion must go beyond 'my finding agrees with X' to 'my finding extends/challenges X because...'	Major	High
50	CH.5 DISCUSSION	Quantitative Results Discussion	Chapter 5 discussion mentions percentages from surveys (e.g., '55% disagreed that liberal peace frameworks have been effectively implemented')	Most quantitative findings are reported in isolation without inferential analysis. No correlations between variables: Does education level correlate with perception of institutional effectiveness? Does ethnicity correlate with views on external intervention? Does age correlate with peace agreement familiarity? These questions are answerable with the data collected but are never asked	Conduct cross-tabulation analysis. Run at least 3 chi-square tests or correlations between key demographic variables and outcome variables. Present and interpret results. This transforms descriptive statistics into analytical findings	Major	High
51	CH.5 DISCUSSION	Interview Quotes Usage	Chapter 5 contains one interview quote: 'Institutions exist on paper, but they often lack the resources and independence needed to function effectively'	A PhD thesis with 30 semi-structured interviews should contain at least 15-20 substantive interview quotes throughout Chapters 4-5. One quote is completely insufficient for a qualitative component. FGDs produced no quoted excerpts at all. This suggests either interviews were not	Include minimum 15-20 interview quotes distributed across findings chapters. Each quote should: (a) identify respondent role (anonymised), (b) be analysed not just reported, (c)	Critical	Urgent

52	CH.5 DISCUSSION	Pie Charts Reference	Section 5.4 references 'pie charts' with file paths from the author's desktop: 'C:\Users\ADMIN\Desktop\pie'	conducted as described or transcription was incomplete The actual pie charts/graphs referenced do not exist in the submitted document – only broken image placeholders are shown. This means the thesis was submitted with missing figures. This is a fundamental submission error	support a specific argument. FGD excerpts should also be quoted and attributed to group discussions Recreate all figures (pie charts, bar graphs) professionally. Do not reference files from your local computer desktop. Embed images properly in the Word document. Ensure all figures have proper numbering (Figure 1, Figure 2) and captions	Critical	Urgent
53	CH.5 DISCUSSION	Variable Operationalisation	Chapter 3 defines independent variables (international interventions, local governance structures, socio-economic development) and dependent variables (political stability, institutional capacity, socio-economic advancement)	These variables are defined in Chapter 3 but NEVER measured in Chapter 4 or 5. No questionnaire items are shown to operationalise 'political stability' or 'institutional capacity'. The case studies do not use these variable categories. The variable framework from Chapter 3 is completely disconnected from the analysis	Map each variable to specific questionnaire items or interview questions. Show how each variable was measured. In Chapter 5, organise findings around variables (not just themes). This creates the analytical coherence the study currently lacks	Critical	Urgent
54	CH.6 CONCLUSIONS	Chapter Structure Duplication	Chapter 6 contains: two separate 'Introduction' sections (6.1 INTRODUCTION and 6.1 DISCUSSION), two sets of conclusions	The chapter is clearly two different drafts merged. One version (the shorter one with Sections 6.1-6.7) is a clean, well-structured conclusion. The other version contains the Discussion, Conclusion (6.2), and Recommendation sections with subsection numbering errors (6.2.1 is in Chapter 5 numbering as '5.2.3')	Keep only the cleaner, more structured version of Chapter 6. Delete the duplicate content. Fix all section numbering errors. Ensure conclusion flows logically from findings presented in previous chapters	Critical	Urgent
55	CH.6 CONCLUSIONS	Conclusions Grounded in Evidence	Section 6.3 presents 5 key conclusions	Conclusions are mostly restatements of the literature review and general claims about South Sudan, not derived from the specific findings of this study. For example: 'Traditional governance systems continue to play an important role' – but the study's own data shows 61% agreed with this. Why isn't the specific percentage cited in the conclusion? Conclusions must be empirically grounded	Rewrite each conclusion to: (1) State the finding from YOUR study with specific data, (2) Compare to what the literature expected, (3) State the theoretical implication. Conclusions must flow from Chapters 4-5, not from Chapter 2	Major	High
56	CH.6 CONCLUSIONS	Recommendations Quality	Section 6.4/6.3 provides 5 recommendations (a-e)	Recommendations are generic and could apply to any post-conflict country: 'promote inclusive governance', 'invest in institutional capacity', 'address socioeconomic grievances'. No recommendation is specific to the unique findings of this study. No timeframe, no responsible actors, no indicators of success. No connection to specific findings	Make each recommendation SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound). For example: not 'promote inclusive governance' but rather 'The Transitional Government of National Unity should establish a National Dialogue Secretariat with	Major	High

					representation from all 10 states by Q4 2026 to develop an inclusive constitutional framework'		
57	CH.6 CONCLUSIONS	Hypotheses Resolution	Three hypotheses stated in Section 1.6 (H1, H2, H3)	None of the three hypotheses are explicitly revisited, tested, or resolved in Chapter 6. A PhD thesis must state, for each hypothesis: accepted, rejected, or partially supported, with evidence. This is a fundamental omission in the conclusions chapter	Add a subsection: 'Hypothesis Testing Results' in Chapter 6. For each hypothesis: restate it, present the relevant evidence (survey percentages, interview themes), and state the conclusion (accepted/rejected/partially supported) with justification	Critical	Urgent
58	CH.6 CONCLUSIONS	Contribution to Knowledge	Section 6.5 states the study 'contributes to academic debates' and 'highlights the importance of understanding the interaction'	The contribution to knowledge is stated entirely in terms of 'contributing to debates' and 'providing insights' – these are not specific contributions. A PhD must articulate WHAT NEW KNOWLEDGE it has produced that did not exist before. The contribution is also not differentiated from what prior studies already found	Write a dedicated 'Original Contribution to Knowledge' section (300-500 words) that states: (1) What specific new findings this study produced, (2) How these extend or challenge existing theory, (3) What unique empirical data was collected, (4) What theoretical advancement was made. This section is often the most important in a PhD thesis	Critical	Urgent
59	CH.6 CONCLUSIONS	Further Research	Section 6.6 suggests 3 areas for further research	Areas suggested (local peace initiatives, transitional justice, comparative studies) are too generic. No connection to specific limitations of THIS study. No methodological suggestions for future research. No emerging questions identified from the findings of this study	Derive further research questions from your specific findings. For example: 'Given that 61% of respondents found traditional leaders more effective than formal institutions, future research should examine: (a) which specific customary mechanisms have highest legitimacy in each ethnic community, (b) constitutional pathways for formal recognition of customary courts'	Minor	Low
60	WRITING QUALITY	Academic Language	Thesis written in English	Multiple instances of extremely informal and non-academic language throughout: 'it would be a remiss', 'words cannot express my gratitude', 'Now, let's address our third point', 'as you can see', 'we will endeavor'. Several AI-generated phrasings detectable: 'the intricate dynamics', 'foray into', 'underscores the pressing need'. Sentences frequently run on for 5-6 clauses	Review every paragraph for academic register. Academic writing avoids first-person plural ('we'), avoids colloquialisms, avoids emotional appeals. Hire an academic English editor. The writing quality must match PhD standards. The thesis reads as if sections were	Major	High

61	WRITING QUALITY	Paragraph Structure	Body paragraphs throughout the thesis	Many paragraphs contain only 2-3 sentences. Academic paragraphs should have: topic sentence, evidence/analysis (3-5 sentences), concluding/linking sentence. Some paragraphs are single sentences. Conversely, some paragraphs are 200+ words with no clear topic sentence	written by different people with very different styles Restructure paragraphs throughout. Each paragraph should address one main idea. The PEEL structure (Point, Evidence, Explanation, Link) should guide paragraph writing. Particularly weak in Sections 1.7, 2.4, 3.2, and 5.5	Major	Medium
62	WRITING QUALITY	Active vs Passive Voice	The thesis uses passive voice throughout: 'it was found that', 'it has been argued that', 'the study was conducted'	Excessive passive voice makes the thesis vague about who is responsible for actions. In methodology, it is especially problematic: 'interviews were conducted' should clearly state by whom, where, when. However, passive voice should be used appropriately – not eliminated entirely	Use active voice for clarity: 'I conducted 30 interviews in Juba between March and July 2024' is clearer than 'Interviews were conducted.' Reserve passive for appropriate academic conventions. Balance is needed	Minor	Medium
63	WRITING QUALITY	Section Headings	Some headings are entire sentences or paragraphs	Section 2.3.4 uses a full paragraph as a heading (starting 'Security Sector Weaknesses Separation and Military Bonding...'). Section 3.1.1 heading begins 'The decision to focus the study on South Sudan as the primary research site is underpinned by several compelling reasons' – 23 words. PhD headings should be 2-8 words maximum	Revise all headings to be concise (2-8 words). Section 2.3.4 heading should be: 'Security Sector Fragmentation'. Section 3.1.1 should be: 'Rationale for Study Site Selection'. Long sentences in headings is a stylistic error common to non-native English academic writers	Minor	Medium
64	WRITING QUALITY	Grammar & Spelling Errors	Throughout the thesis	Notable errors: 'Fukuyama (20024)' [date error], 'deep-rooted animosity' repeatedly misspelled, 'undetermined' used where 'undermined' is intended, 'extrajudicial killings' paragraph formatted as a heading, 'disseminate' used incorrectly. Tense inconsistency: thesis shifts between present and past tense within sections	Conduct thorough proofreading. Use grammar checking software (Grammarly). Engage a professional proofreader familiar with academic writing. Check all dates and names for accuracy. Standardise tense usage (past tense for completed research)	Major	High
65	REFERENCES	Reference Format	References section at end of thesis	References are not consistently formatted. Mix of APA, Harvard, and web URL citation styles. Some references lack: volume numbers, issue numbers, page numbers. Some books lack publisher location. Journal articles sometimes list only volume, not issue. Website references sometimes lack access dates	Adopt one citation style consistently throughout (recommend APA 7th edition as appropriate for social sciences). Use a reference manager. Check every reference for completeness. Journal articles must have: Author(s). (Year). Title. Journal, Volume(Issue), Pages. DOI	Major	High

66	REFERENCES	Reference Count	Reference list contains approximately 45-50 sources	This is insufficient for a PhD thesis on a complex multidisciplinary topic. PhD theses in Peace and Conflict Studies typically cite 150-250+ sources. The literature review for a study spanning 12 years (2011-2023) of conflict in the world's newest nation should engage a far wider scholarly literature	Expand reference list to minimum 120-150 sources. Specifically add: academic journal articles (Journal of Eastern African Studies, African Affairs, International Security, Third World Quarterly, Conflict, Security & Development), NGO reports (ICG, ACLED, Sudd Institute), UN documents, government sources, legal instruments	Major	High
67	REFERENCES	Missing Foundational Texts	References section lacks foundational texts cited in the body	Missing from reference list but cited in text: Paris (2004) 'At War's End'; Richmond (2011) 'A Post-Liberal Peace'; Mac Ginty (2010, 2011) works; Barnett et al. (2007); Chesterman, Ignatieff & Thakur (2005); De Waal (2015) – his 'Political Marketplace' work. These are central citations but are not in the reference list	Add all cited works to reference list immediately. Cross-check every in-text citation against the reference list. This is a fundamental academic integrity requirement	Critical	Urgent
68	REFERENCES	Web Sources	Several references are to websites only (CARE, Mercy Corps, Simplilearn, OAGC)	Academic PhD theses should minimise web-only sources, particularly for theoretical arguments. 'Simplilearn.com' is cited as an authority on data collection methods – this is a commercial online learning platform, not an academic source. 'Leonard (2001)' linked to a transportation research PDF is cited for qualitative data analysis – inappropriate source	Replace web sources in theoretical sections with peer-reviewed literature. Web sources from UN, AU, government documents, or reputable NGOs (ICG, Human Rights Watch, ACLED) are acceptable for empirical data. Simplilearn and similar sites should not be cited in any academic work	Major	High
69	APPENDICES	Missing Appendices	No appendices are attached to the thesis	A PhD thesis of this type requires: Appendix A (Research Questionnaire), Appendix B (Interview Guide), Appendix C (FGD Guide), Appendix D (Informed Consent Form), Appendix E (Ethics Approval/Clearance Letter), Appendix F (List of Key Informants by Category), Appendix G (Map of Study Sites). None of these exist	Create all necessary appendices. The questionnaire and interview guides are particularly important – without them, the study cannot be evaluated for methodological validity or replicated	Critical	Urgent
70	VARIABLE FRAMEWORK	Variable Operationalisation	Table in Chapter 3 lists independent and dependent variables	Variables listed (political stability, institutional capacity, socio-economic advancement) are abstract concepts. No operationalisation table showing: variable → dimension → indicator → measurement tool (questionnaire item/interview question) → scale. This is the core of quantitative/mixed research design	Create a Variable Operationalisation Table: Column 1=Variable, Column 2=Dimensions, Column 3=Indicators, Column 4=Measurement Tool, Column 5=Scale. This should be in Chapter 3 and directly link to the questionnaire attached as appendix	Critical	Urgent
71	VARIABLE FRAMEWORK	Independent Variable – Int'l Interventions	Defined as: humanitarian, development, and diplomatic initiatives	How was 'international intervention' measured in the questionnaire? No	Develop 4-6 Likert scale items to measure perceptions	Major	High

72	VARIABLE FRAMEWORK	Dependent Variable – Political Stability	Defined as: state free from violent conflict and institutional deficiencies	questionnaire items specifically operationalise this variable. Survey table (4.4.4) asks for 'role of international organizations' with 4 response options – but this is a perception question, not a measurement of the variable itself Political stability as a dependent variable requires objective measurement (conflict events, ACLED data, political risk indices) AND subjective measurement (perceptions). Only subjective measurement appears in the survey. No ACLED data or Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) data is used to triangulate perceptions with objective conflict incidence	of international intervention quality, effectiveness, and appropriateness. Compute a composite score. Analyse variation by respondent category (government vs CSO vs community) Triangulate subjective stability perceptions with objective ACLED/UCDP conflict data for 2011-2023. Create a timeline showing conflict events alongside survey perceptions. This would significantly strengthen the quantitative component	Major	High
73	VARIABLE FRAMEWORK	Conceptual Framework – Variable Relationships	Section 2.9 lists variables without showing directional relationships	No attempt is made to show whether relationships between variables are hypothesised as: direct/indirect, positive/negative, linear/non-linear, mediated/moderated. For example: Does 'international intervention' affect 'political stability' directly, or is the effect mediated by 'local governance structures'? These are the central analytical questions the framework should answer	Develop a path diagram or structural model showing hypothesised relationships. Use arrows to show direction. Use + or – to show expected direction of effect. This diagram should guide which statistical tests are appropriate	Critical	Urgent
74	OVERALL STRUCTURE	Chapter Count & Organisation	Thesis has 6 chapters	Chapter organisation is inconsistent with the thesis as presented. Based on content, the thesis appears to have merged what should be 7-8 chapters. Abstract promises a 6-chapter structure but the chapter numbering and content do not match this promise. Chapter 4 has characteristics of both case study chapter AND findings chapter	Restructure to standard PhD chapter format: Ch1=Introduction, Ch2=Literature Review, Ch3=Methodology, Ch4=Case Studies (qualitative), Ch5=Survey Findings (quantitative), Ch6=Discussion, Ch7=Conclusions & Recommendations. This requires significant reorganisation	Critical	Urgent
75	OVERALL STRUCTURE	Thesis Length	Estimated 60,000-70,000 words including repetitions	Due to extensive duplication (two Chapter 2s, two Chapter 3s, two sets of objectives, two demographic tables), the effective unique scholarly content may be only 35,000-40,000 words – potentially below the minimum for a PhD thesis in many institutions. More critically, the quantity does not compensate for the qualitative gaps identified above	Remove all duplicate sections. What remains may need to be substantially expanded, particularly: literature review (needs 10,000-15,000 more words of critical engagement), methodology (needs 2,000-3,000 more words of justification), analysis (needs primary data and theory engagement)	Major	High

76	OVERALL STRUCTURE	Figure & Table Numbering	Tables are numbered inconsistently	Tables are numbered 1-8 in Chapter 5 but there are also unnumbered frequency tables embedded in Chapter 4. Two tables are labeled 'Table 1' (Table 1 in Ch4 showing response rate, and Table 1 in Ch5 showing demographic data). Figures referenced but not appearing. No list of tables or list of figures in the front matter	Create a List of Tables and List of Figures in the front matter. Number all tables and figures consecutively throughout the document (Table 1, Table 2... not starting from 1 again in each chapter). Ensure all referenced figures appear	Major	Medium
77	OVERALL STRUCTURE	Theoretical Contribution	Thesis claims to contribute to 'liberal peace theory and post-conflict state-building'	The thesis never proposes any theoretical modification, new framework, or advancement of existing theory. It applies existing theory descriptively. A PhD contribution requires: either empirically testing a theoretical claim, or proposing a modification to theory, or developing a new conceptual tool. The study confirms what Paris, Richmond and De Waal already argued – that is not a PhD-level theoretical contribution	Identify one specific theoretical contribution: Does South Sudan represent a NEW TYPE of liberal peace failure (not just institutional, but structural)? Does the data suggest a modification to hybrid peace theory for oil-dependent states? Develop a specific theoretical argument that advances the field	Critical	Urgent
78	OVERALL STRUCTURE	Institutional Permissions	Research conducted with government officials in a politically sensitive context	No mention of: whether Ministry of Interior or equivalent approved research, whether UNMISS or NGOs provided access letters, whether University of Juba research office approved the study. In South Sudan specifically, research with government officials requires formal permissions	Add a section on institutional permissions and access. If permissions were obtained verbally or informally, state this. If this information was omitted for security reasons, state this. Examiners need to assess whether research was conducted appropriately	Major	Medium

PRIORITISED REMEDIATION ROADMAP

Based on the 78 observations above, GEMTECH recommends the following phased revision approach:

PHASE	TIMEFRAME	ACTIONS REQUIRED	AFFECTED SECTIONS	IMPACT
Phase 1	Weeks 1-4	CRITICAL FIXES: (1) Decide on research design – qualitative or mixed-methods – and make thesis consistent throughout; (2) Reconcile all contradictory tables and fix data integrity issues; (3) Remove all duplicate chapters/sections; (4) Add questionnaire, interview guide, FGD guide as appendices; (5) Fix broken image references and recreate all figures professionally; (6) Reconcile objectives (delete one set); (7) Add conceptual framework diagram	All chapters; Appendices; Front Matter	Thesis becomes submittable
Phase 2	Weeks 5-10	MAJOR IMPROVEMENTS: (1) Expand literature review with 30+ additional sources, especially South Sudan-specific literature 2018-2025; (2) Add 15-20 interview quotes distributed across analysis chapters; (3) Conduct and report SPSS inferential statistics (chi-square, correlations); (4) Rewrite methodology to accurately reflect what was done; (5) Develop positionality and reflexivity section; (6) Revise all recommendations to be SMART; (7) Resolve hypotheses in conclusion chapter	Chapters 2, 3, 4, 5, 6; References	Thesis meets PhD standard
Phase 3	Weeks 11-16	QUALITY ENHANCEMENT: (1) Professional academic English editing of entire thesis; (2) Develop original contribution to knowledge statement; (3) Standardise all citations to APA 7th edition; (4)	All chapters; References; Appendices	Thesis achieves excellence

Create comprehensive list of tables and figures; (5) Add all missing appendices; (6) Final proofreading for grammar, spelling, formatting; (7) Verify all web links and update references

GEMTECH RESEARCH & DATA ANALYSIS CO. LTD

This review is provided for academic improvement purposes. All observations are offered constructively to assist the candidate in producing a thesis of the highest scholarly quality. GEMTECH is available for consultation on any aspect of this review.