

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_116901
Title of the Manuscript:	Civic Education and National Development: A Comprehensive Analysis of 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>)

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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>	<p>The MS focuses on the importance of Civic Education for all to ensure the development of a Nation, in this case, Zambia.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>See detailed comments below.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>I find it very strange that two-thirds of the references are all authored by the same group of authors. Any author is free to cite his own work but not to the exclusion of other authors, particularly as the entire paper is heavily review-based, although an empirical analysis is detailed in the methodology.</p> <p>While a quantitative review has been carried out, only one set of observations has been presented in one single table, and another in the form of a pie-graph. Surely other questions must have been asked and the results need to be cited and discussed.</p> <p>The abstract itself states “This study used descriptive design to analyze the data. Interviews and questionnaires were used to collect data. Qualitative and Quantitative techniques of data analysis was used, and data was presented on the analytical tools such as tables, figures and charts.</p> <p>I also see no quantitative techniques used anywhere in the paper.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language needs minor editing. However, there is a lot of repetition, which detracts from the quality of the paper. It is suggested that the Author/Authors delete the repeated texts to make the paper more readable.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The recommendations are well thought out and written.</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:	Nira Ramachandran
Department, University & Country	Institute of Economic Growth, Delhi University, India