

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_96996
Title of the Manuscript:	Gender Equity in Leadership positions in Print Media Companies in Tanzania: A Review of theoretical Literature
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/editorial-policy>)

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is providing valuable information about how much gender equity is required leadership position.</p> <p>2. Yes the title is suitable for the article.</p> <p>3. Yes it covers all the aspect.</p> <p>4. Yes structure found OK but needs rewriting in some suggested parts.</p> <p>5. Somehow, need to focus on references.</p> <p>6. Reference are not sufficient. Whatever reports or survey used in this study should be properly mentioned in reference section as per the guideline of Journal. Morna, et al. (2010), Sturm (2009), (Knight Commission, 2019), Sahu, G. K., & Alam, S. (2013), (Mahler & Rutenberg, 2019), Gallagher et al. (2010), (Cavendish, 2019), (Wong, 2019), (Bowles et al., 2005), Hanitzsch and Hanusch (2012), (Castilla, 2008)., Castilla, 2016, Bohnet, 2016, Geronimus, 1996, Ferrier & Garud-Patkar, 2018 and many more are not properly cited. All reference should be rechecked and properly cited.</p> <p>7. Abstract, Paragraph II in Introduction and Conclusion are is invariably same. Author should rewrite the paragraph II in Introduction part and Conclusion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	It is advisable to extend conclusion and recommendation part and also mentioned the future viability of article.	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Priya
Department, University & Country	Institute of Management Sciences, University of Lucknow, India