Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJESS_85945**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Youth and Patriotism in Zambia: Is Voting the Only way to Show Patriotism?**
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 1.6

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**The literature review is very poor. Further support is needed with the findings of various studies on the subject under investigation.** **There are no research questions that need to be added and it should be clear.** **The Methodology is vague and raises many questions. The author needs to clarify what does he mean by "descriptive survey research design" in relation to the quantitative elements required in this design.** **In qualitative research, the results are not generalized ("were purposively selected from across the ten provinces of Zambia so that the findings could be generalized"), therefore this should be corrected.** **The thematic analysis reported to have been used is not supported. The author should clarify, which author's thematic analysis were used (e.g. Brown & Clarke, 2006,. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative research in psychology, 3 (2), 77-101., Bryman, Willing).** **To be considered that themes are not used to answer the research questions ("Four main themes were used to answer the research questions"), but emerge from the data as final results that answer the r.q.** **A more detailed report, should be used, on how exactly was the thematic analysis done: How many codes were given etc.** **The themes, to be given as "findings".** **Finally, should be clarified how the validity and reliability of the research was checked (eg The Research Audit Trial - Enhancing Trustworthiness in Qualitative Inquiry, member validation).** **In the discussion, should be omited the wish lists and make an explicit reference to whether or not the findings are in line with other research.** **Finally, suggestions for future research should be added.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	**Panagiotis Efst. Spiliopoulos**
Department, University & Country	**Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece**