

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_SAJSSSE_120521</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Gender Equality in the Higher Education Workforce</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p><b>A manuscript addressing gender equality in the higher education workforce is crucial for the scientific community.</b> It contributes to a critical body of knowledge by shedding light on systemic biases and disparities that hinder women's advancement in academia. Such research can inform policy changes, institutional practices, and mentorship programs aimed at creating a more equitable and inclusive higher education landscape.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes the title of the manuscript is very suitable and is very effective.</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section?  <b>The abstract provides a solid foundation for the research but could be strengthened by further elaboration and specificity.</b>  <b>Strengths:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly defines the concept of gender equality and its dimensions (education, employment, politics).</li> <li>• States the focus of the paper on gender well-being in higher education.</li> <li>• Indicates the use of secondary data for analysis.</li> </ul> <b>Suggestions for Improvement:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Specify the research question:</b> While the abstract hints at the challenges of achieving gender well-being, explicitly stating the research question would provide clearer direction. For example, "This paper investigates the specific challenges women face in attaining leadership positions within higher education institutions."</li> <li>• <b>Elaborate on the concept of "gender well-being":</b> This term is somewhat vague. Defining it more clearly or providing examples of its components would enhance the abstract's clarity.</li> <li>• <b>Highlight the novelty of the research:</b> What sets this study apart from previous research? What new insights does it aim to contribute?</li> <li>• <b>Briefly outline the methodology:</b> While the abstract states that secondary data will be used, providing a brief overview of the data sources or analysis techniques would strengthen the methodological rigor.</li> </ul> <p>By incorporating these suggestions, the abstract can become a more compelling and informative summary of the research.</p> </p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	
<p><b>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>A scientifically robust and technically sound manuscript on gender equality in higher education demonstrate a strong foundation in gender studies, sociology, and education. It employs rigorous research methodologies, present data clearly and accurately, and engage in critical analysis of findings.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p>	<p><b>Yes the references are up-to-date but there is need to proof read the references. Also do some work on structure. There is minor mistakes in the references.</b></p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes the language that author used is suitable and easy to understand.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Overall the manuscript is good enough. Try to proofread the minor mistakes. Also work on references.	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Amna Younis</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Pir Mehr Ali Shah Arid Agriculture University, Pakistan</b>