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	**Article**

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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 manuscript sheds the light on Voters' Experience During Elections of 2011 to 2021 in the Chadiza Constituency, Eastern Province, Zambia. This done through provision of a comprehensive analysis of the Voters Experiences during the elections. The understanding of Voters experience is essential for risk management and mitigating possible shortcomings in the future elections. Negative Voters experience can contribute immensely to Voter Apathy.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**Hermeneutics phenomenology is about both description of experiences and interpretation of and meanings. The study is about the human experiences in relation to the Voters' Experience During Elections of 2011 to 2021. The Title is thus suitable for the article as presented**	
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 Abstract is comprehensive, I however observed that the author was tempted to put more methodology issues on the Abstract. I have highlighted all that I suggest should be moved to the methodology section in Red. The purpose of the Abstract is and they should not be too long or detailed.**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**The subsections and the structure of the manuscript are well crafted and cogently display the flow of ideas.**	
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.	**The manuscripts exposes the rigorous methodology and present diverse perspectives. From the onset the researcher present the diverse literary observation from the Global, Continental and Zambian perspective (Funnel Approach) this make the manuscript to be sound. The usage of qualitative approaches ensured that the voters experiences in relation to the elections**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	**The Author has used reasonable number of references in the manuscript**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The Language on the article is suitable for scholarly communication	
Optional/General comments	Good Attempt	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Phakamile Thwala**
Department, University & Country	**University of South Africa, South Africa**