

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 (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.	<div><div></div><div>This article provides insights into the causes, effects, and mitigation of electoral violence in Chadiza Constituency, Zambia.</div><div></div><div>Manuscripts ses a hermeneutic phenomenological approach to highlight voters' experiences during elections.</div><div></div><div>Research paper offers practical guidance for policymakers to prevent electoral violence and promote democratic participation.</div><div></div><div>The manuscript balances existing literature by focusing on a rural constituency, often overlooked in electoral violence studies.</div></div>	
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	
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.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, but it can be concise for good and scientific reflection	
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.	<div>Need to address research tools and techniques (sampling methods) in comprehensive manners</div> <div>Need to explore conclusions and it does not match with the finding</div> <div>Need to include secondary data for making the article relevant.</div> <div>Statement of the problems should be point wise and focused.</div> <div>Location map should be in proper manner and no basic elements have been included as scale, directions and latitudes and longitudes</div>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments	Need to revise language and sentence formation of the article. Follow the uniformity in the articles and its headings	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General 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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rohit Kumar
Department, University & Country	Banaras Hindu University, India