

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_112068
Title of the Manuscript:	Uncovering the Driving Forces Behind Succession Planning in Namibian Commercial Public Enterprises: A Look at Executive Leadership
Type of the Article	Original Research 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, it is especially for social studies in Namibia and Sub-Saharan countries. 2. Yes 3. It is. However, the study methodology in the abstract is different than one in the Methodology section of the paper. 4. The structure of the paper is appropriate. However, the following sections could be improved: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Introduction Section: It introduces succession planning but fails to outline what are defined or classified as public commercial enterprises in Namibia, as compared to other countries that the Journal focuses on. b. Literature Review Section: the section does not analyse what is classified as executive leadership in the Namibian context, and benchmark with other countries which have similar commercial public enterprises. c. Methodology Section: In the abstract section- constructivist is stated as the methodology. However, in the Methodology section – Pragmatism is stated. These two methodologies are different, and the Author must indicate which one was used and the reason thereof. d. Data Analysis Section: There is a need to indicate how credibility, validity and reliability was done for both qualitative and quantitative methods that were used in this study. 5. Some changes need to be made as per the section above. 6. Yes 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Its sufficient</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Andretta Tsebe
Department, University & Country	South Africa