

Review of: "Empowering Women in Leadership and Management Positions to Maintain Gender Equality: A Case Study on Sidama Region"

Louisemarie Combrink¹

¹ North West University South Africa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review: Empowering Women in Leadership and Management Positions to Maintain Gender Equality: A Case Study on Sidama Region.

The article addresses very important matters - women's empowerment is salient to human rights, economic advancement, and many other spheres.

I find the theoretical/literature review section a bit thin. Important points are made, but little engagement with the literature occurs and source references are scant. The definitions of terms such as stereotypes and the like should be more critically studied and argued.

In the introduction of the article, a number of research gaps are indicated that the article sets out to address. These are all important issues - I would suggest keeping the introduction as is, but adding a sentence or two at the end of this section to consolidate the different gaps dealt with in the article.

The specificity of the region under study as regards women's empowerment needs and the like could have been expounded in a bit more detail - the African context, the Ethiopian reality, and the actual reality of the region under study.

Language: there are some linguistic and editing issues that must be addressed.

1. Specific research objective must be Specific research objectives (add s).
2. (c) under specific research objectives is listed as the "main" objective - this is not right. The main objective is listed under main objectives.
3. Under the empirical review, the number 5 should be written as "five."
4. Under the ethical considerations, the phrasing "would be" is used - it should be "was."
5. In the tables, similar errors occur. Please look at capitalisation (e.g., "lack" should be "Lack"; "Empowering position" should be "Empowering positions", "Survey result" should be "Survey results" - this also in the text).
6. Look at paragraphing under the discussion of results as well as recommendations - some paragraphs are very long and should be broken into shorter ones.
7. In the discussion, mention is made of "result of the study" - must be "results of the study."
8. Capitalisation in the references is inconsistent.

9. The word “serotypes” is used throughout - I believe it must be “stereotypes.”