

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_107782
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTIVENESS OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTIONS: THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF UNIVERSITIES' GENDER POLICIES IN TANZANIA
Type of the Article	Policy Article

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>The present study deals with a topic which is relevant for society in general: Gender equality, in this case, at university leadership and university policy in Tanzania.</p> <p>From my point of view, the title is suitable to the article. However, since the fact analysed is general in African Universities, I suggest the authors to start from a broad title and then concretizes it to Tanzania. For example: "Analysis of affirmative actions and gender equality in the policy of East African Universities: The case of Tanzania"</p> <p>The abstract s comprehensive. However, when explaining their results, I suggest authors to refer to their findings more directly, for example: The findings in the present study show that... In the different parts of the abstract, authors use capital letters, but not in the conclusion. I recommend to use Capital letters only in the first letter as told in the authors' guidelines.</p> <p>Line 1 of the abstract: o avoid repetition, <u>Tanzanian Universities</u> rather than <u>in Universities in Tanzania</u>.</p> <p>Line 3: <u>males</u> and females rather that male and female</p> <p>Line 14: <u>how effective the actions are</u> and not <u>how are the actions effective</u> (that is not a question), same problem in the conclusion.</p> <p>Keywords (and not key words): I suggest authors to add more words since they have the possibility to add five more. Only three keywords does not give the reader a wide overview of the article. You may add, among others: Tanzania, university, gender equality, females. Beware also about capital letters.</p> <p>Yes they are appropriate. Nevertheless, it is better if the title of your section is <u>review of the literature</u> than only <u>literature</u>. I also recommend the authors to be enlarge their conclusion. The manuscript gives much more information than what is summarised in the conclusion. I believe you should refer again to the objective of the study, the results, your conclusion and, if so, implications in the policy of Tanzanian universities. I recommend authors to avoid words in bold.</p> <p>The authors focus on questions written in bold at the end of the different subsections of the results section. For a more scientific paper, I strongly suggest the authors to write research questions which will help them to develop the different subsections instead of the questions in bold. There are a lot of sources in google which may help them on how to formulate the adequate research questions. You should write them at the end of the literature review, for example: Taking into consideration the literature above mentioned, the following research questions are posed: ---</p> <p>After each figure, the authors explain the purpose of the analysis. From my view, you should do that in the section devoted to data analysis and not after each figure. However, in the results section, you should refer to the figure in order to describe your results. For example: As shown in figure 1, after analysis, the most frequent and cantered word in the cloud is..., followed by... . If possible and if you have the repetition frequency, I suggest authors to include a table to illustrate the number of repetitions of the most frequent words. I remind the authors that the discussion about the tables and figures should appear in the text before the appearance of the respective tables and figures.</p> <p>There are two figures in the paper, but it is not clear if the first corresponds only to the subsection</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<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>“recruitment” or for that section and the next three. The second figure corresponds to the subsection “capacity building”.</p> <p>There are references in the discussion section which do not appear in the literature review, for example, Carr, Gunn, Raj, Kaplan, & Freund, (2017). In order to discuss results with those from other papers, authors should first mention them in the literature review together with the most relevant part of their respective studies. I suggest the authors to check every reference in the discussion.</p> <p>When the authors refer to a quote from a university text, at the end they use in bold letters the university with letters from A to D according to the four targeted universities. But, I recommend the authors not to repeat. For example, page 11, lines 3 and 4: the University C states, “To expand networking with gender professional groups,” University C. I recommend to write the reference of the text at the end of the quotation rather than University C.</p> <p>The references are adequate, however, I mention the author’s guidelines: “References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text [...]. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets”. I also recommend authors to have a look at the author’s guidelines of the journal and follow the reference style guidelines.</p> <p>Within the text, when a manuscript written by different authors is mentioned for the first time, I recommend authors to write all authors. For example, second paragraph of the literature review: Walker et al. (2021). You should refer to all the authors.</p> <p>Sometimes, when there are three or more authors in a reference within the text, “al” is written without “.”. I recommend the authors to go through the whole manuscript and make sure that they follow the journal’s guidelines and write “al.”.</p> <p>Sometimes, the year of publication is separated from the noun with a comma, please avoid it. For instance, second paragraph of the literature review: Kagoda, (2019). Please change it for Kagoda [number in the reference list and in order of appearance]. Do the same in all references within the text.</p> <p>There are references within the text which are not included in the reference list, for example, Fortado et al. (2021), Hanninsen et al. (2022). I strongly recommend authors to make sure that all references are included in the list and that all the authors are written in the first reference.</p> <p>The authors refer to studies carried out in Denmark. I recommend the authors to include literature about gender equality in other countries of East Africa.</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.7

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Especially in the introduction and in the literature review, it seems that some words have been withdrawn and has not been checked for language. I strongly recommend the authors to read the text and change sentences which are not understandable for the reader, for example, page 4 second paragraph requires a major revision of English.</p> <p>I recommend the authors to keep faithful to the tense employed: When commenting findings of other papers, sometimes they use present tense and sometimes past tense. Page 4, fourth paragraph: Fortado et al (2021) <u>show</u> / White (2019) also <u>accused</u>.</p> <p>Authors sometimes use italics when there is no reason for that, for instance, page 4, fourth paragraph: Fortado <u>et al</u></p> <p>I suggest authors to take care of small mistakes such as (I only give some examples): Page 4, line 22: More ever (moreover, you mean?) I think there is a "." missing. Page 4, line 26: women continues to be misconception (women continue to be a misconception, you mean?) Page 9, line 7: the policy documents the desires to have (the policy's goal is to have equal representation, you mean?). Page 9, line 21: University Fourthly (University. Fourthly...) I also recommend to remove bold letters. Page 11, line 21: it is imbalances in recruitment that leads to... (there are imbalances, you mean?) Page 2, line 11: from my point of view, the word "statistics" is wrongly used. A statistical study implies tests. In that case, this is descriptive analysis, so I recommend the authors to use the word "data".</p> <p>I recommend the authors to review the text again and improve the quality of English language used throughout the text. Sometimes, due to the aspects I mentioned above, following the text becomes difficult for the reader.</p> <p>I also suggest the authors to check for double spacing. In some cases, a space is also missing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Alexandre Martín-Chazeaud</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Spain</p>