

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

Compulsory 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.	The article's strength lies in its unique focus on electoral violence in the rural Chadiza District, offering insights beyond the commonly studied urban areas. By exploring voters' experiences over a decade, it provides a valuable perspective on the sustained impact and causes of electoral violence. Using qualitative methods, the study captures the social and emotional nuances of electoral violence, giving depth to the issue.	Much appreciated
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is not suitable 1. Exploring the Causes, Impact, and Mitigation of Electoral Violence: A Case Study of Chadiza District, Zambia (2011-2021) 2. Election Violence in Zambia: the case study of Chadiza District 3. The Impact of Electoral Violence on Rural Voter Engagement in Zambia	Changes have been made as guided
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.	The second paragraph can be summarized to shorten the number of words in the abstract.	Appreciated and summary of the Abstract has been done.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	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.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness by utilizing a qualitative approach well-suited for capturing nuanced voter experiences. The use of hermeneutic phenomenology provides a sound methodological foundation, enabling in-depth analysis and interpretation of data gathered through interviews and focus group discussions.	So encouraging
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :-	References are not recent	Some corrections have been made

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments	Yes	Thank you
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Check and Format In-Text Citations:</div><div><ul style="list-style-type: none">Ensure all in-text citations conform to APA guidelines. For example, change any citations like “Perlez, (1992)” to “Perlez (1992)” without a comma after the author’s name.Verify that each in-text citation has a matching reference entry, including any missing references mentioned by the reviewer: <i>Perlez (1992)</i>, <i>Habasonde (2018)</i>, <i>Akpan (2015)</i>, <i>ECZ (2006)</i>, <i>Bekoe (2012)</i>, <i>Raleigh et al. (2010)</i>, etc.Avoid acronyms in the reference list by spelling out full names, such as <i>Electoral Commission of Zambia</i> for ECZ. Ensure that these names are consistent across both in-text citations and the reference list.</div></div> <div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Introduction Section:</div><div><ul style="list-style-type: none">The statement “Electoral violence in Zambia can be traced back to the re-introduction of multiparty participatory democracy prior to 1991 elections” needs citation if it’s not the author’s original insight. Add an appropriate reference or rephrase if it’s based on general knowledge or observation.</div></div> <div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Statement of the Problem:</div><div><ul style="list-style-type: none">The time frame of the study is 2011 to 2021, but only literature from 2011 is currently cited. Add recent sources, ideally from 2020–2021, that discuss instances of electoral violence in Zambia. This will make the literature review more relevant and reflective of current trends in Zambian elections.</div></div> <div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Literature Review Section:</div><div><ul style="list-style-type: none">Incorporate a balance of older foundational studies with more recent studies (ideally from 2018 to 2023) to ensure the review is both comprehensive and current. Updating the literature with sources from the past five years will capture recent challenges and developments in Zambia’s electoral processes.</div></div> <div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Recommendation Section:</div><div><ul style="list-style-type: none">Convert the recommendations from bullet points to structured paragraphs. Each recommendation should include an explanation to strengthen the importance and feasibility of each suggestion. This approach will enhance the readability and impact of the recommendations, which are crucial in a study of this nature.</div></div>	All the comments have been attended to and we really appreciate.

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