

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_99692
Title of the Manuscript:	Uncovering Administration Challenges Faced by Female Social Sciences Heads of Department in Selected Secondary Schools of Lusaka Urban District in Zambia
Type of the 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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Generally, one does not have citations in the abstract. I'd remove them. "the participants were carefully selected with a view to the unique information and insights that they can contribute" List the characteristics specifically. What inclusionary and exclusionary criteria? Did you collect demographic information? This information helps with generalization and transferability. How did you develop the semistructured interview? How did you validate/establish reliability? How did you recruit the sample? How did you conduct the interview? Did you record the interview? How did you analyze the data—coding or ????? Any computer programs? What qualitative techniques? How were themes developed? Major problem. You conducted 25 interviews, yet you provide two to three large quotes per sample with little context or explanation. You should have much more smaller quotes in each theme as well as negative examples. There should be limitations and future recommendations. Bibliography is light.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Article is fine.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	David C. Coker
Department, University & Country	Fort Hays State University, USA