

Review of: "Women education in Ethiopia"

Anthony Amoah¹

¹ University of Environment and Sustainable Development, Somanya

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The study investigates the determinants of women education in Ethiopia using the DHS dataset. The paper has merit provided the following are addressed.

I think the title should read "Women education in Ethiopia: What are the determinants" The Intro reads better like this "Education is a vehicle for national economic development as well as individual advancement. Historically, girls were denied opportunities for schooling in most of the regions and societies of Ethiopia. So, this study is geared towards the factors affecting women's education levels in Ethiopia."

The statement "many women within the developing world have few contacts with the outside world" appears as an old fashion claim. Until the recent social network platforms, this could have been argued to be true but certainly not true now because relative to men, it is possible for women in Ethiopia, to be more connected to people outside the world just by a click of a social network button irrespective of whether the person is highly educated or not. Kindly revise the claim or better still provide a valid justification for the claim.

Under Introduction, last paragraph, was the author (s) writing a century ago or a gone? If the former, then kindly check and proofread the entire manuscript for similar typos. Can the objective of the study be stated clearly under the Introduction section?

First use of the following -LRT, AIC, and BIC must be stated in full.

Under Variables in the study, last line, you report 25% level and 5% level. My question is of what? 25% or 5% level of what? This should be made clearly.

The authors can request for evidence of the ethical clearance and report accordingly. A line or two justifying why the ordered logistic was used will help.

The author(s) claim the fixed effect model is used for the estimation, however, how this was done is unclear in the entire paper. In most studies, the estimation table shows evidence of the fixed effects however, that is not the case in the present work.

The author(s) are investigating determinants of education level of women in Ethiopia; however, no correlational test of the covariates is reported. Again, the author (s) must state clearly that the work should be interpreted as association rather than causal determinants. This is because of the potential endogeneity problems that may stem from a reverse causality

between education and wealth.

I was expecting to see some interactions. For example, urban and wealth. That would have unearthed some interesting findings.

Instead of reporting antilog of the odds under discussions, why not margins?

Why is no education rather not used as the reference category?

Why do you report three intercepts? This appears a bit unclear and strange. Interestingly, the “cuts-offs” are not reported or mentioned.

In my view, the discussion section appears more of analysis than discussion. So far, I’m struggling to appreciate the discussions in there.