

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_126143
Title of the Manuscript:	Voters’ Experience During Elections of 2011 to 2021: A Hermeneutic Phenomenological Approach in Chadiza Constituency, Eastern Province, Zambia.
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<input type="checkbox"/> This article provides insights into the causes, effects, and mitigation of electoral violence in Chadiza Constituency, Zambia. <input type="checkbox"/> Manuscripts ses a hermeneutic phenomenological approach to highlight voters' experiences during elections. <input type="checkbox"/> Research paper offers practical guidance for policymakers to prevent electoral violence and promote democratic participation. <input type="checkbox"/> The manuscript balances existing literature by focusing on a rural constituency, often overlooked in electoral violence studies.	Much appreciated and so encouraging.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Voters' Perspectives on Elections (2011-2021): A Hermeneutic Study in Chadiza Constituency, Eastern Province, Zambia	Changes have been made to Title. Thank you
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract should be in short and focused. Most of the portion of last paragraph is unnecessary.	Abstract has been summarised and thank you for your guidance.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, but it can be concise for good and scientific reflection	Noted and Thank you
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Need to address research tools and techniques (sampling methods) in comprehensive manners Need to explore conclusions and it does not match with the finding Need to include secondary data for making the article relevant. Statement of the problems should be point wise and focused. Location map should be in proper manner and no basic elements have been included as scale, directions and latitudes and longitudes	Comments have been attended to.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Sufficient	Thank you
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need to revise language and sentence formation of the article. Follow the uniformity in the articles and its headings	Comment attended to
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	Noted