

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_97658
Title of the Manuscript:	WOMEN AND MINING IN ZAMBIA: OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment		Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1- The manuscript is significant for the scholarly community since it examined women in mining in Zambia: opportunities and difficulties</p> <p>2-The article's title is appropriate.</p> <p>3- the abstract should be reframed to include the five main elements of abstract as indicated</p> <p>4 -The manuscript's structure should be restructured to standard paper format, e.g., employ appropriate sections 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0....</p> <p>5- The work contains accurate scientific information, but a data analysis method to test for significant differences and develop a regression model should be included.</p> <p>6- The references are insufficient and outdated; enhance the reference with updated literature search</p> <p>Further suggestions/comments are presented in the paper, which is attached</p>	<p>The manuscript is good and it adds value to the body of knowledge, however, the following comments will enhance the paper</p> <p>Reframe the abstract to include the five main elements of abstract such as,</p> <p>i. Introduction. This is the first part of the abstract, and should be brief and attractive to the reader at the same time. ...</p> <p>ii. Research significance. This usually answers the question: Why did you do this research?</p> <p>iii. Methodology. ...</p> <p>iv. Key finding/results. ...</p> <p>v. Conclusion/implications of findings</p> <p>Remove citing from the abstract and reduce the abstract words to 250 – 300 words</p> <p>The introduction and literature survey should be updated</p> <p>The manuscript's structure should be restructured to standard paper format,</p> <p>Restructure the paper to follow a standard structure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction, 2. Methods, 3. Results, 4. Discussion, 5. Conclusion, <p>The references are insufficient and outdated; Also, pay attention to a few comments on the article in the attached file According to the attached file , the document has a 13 percent similarity index. Finally, if all of the comments are handled, the paper's quality will be improved.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Major revision and corrections are needed on the manuscript		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The paper is good because it advances the knowledge of women in mining in Zambia: opportunities and difficulties		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sangotayo, Emmanuel Olayimika
Department, University & Country	Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Nigeria