

Review of: "Exploring the Relationship Between Gender and Sustainable Development Competencies in Higher Education Institutions: Insights from a Zimbabwean University"

Syed Bukhari¹

¹ Islamia University of Bahawalpur

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review Report on Exploring the Relationship Between Gender and Sustainable Development Competencies in Higher Education Institutions: Insights from a Zimbabwean University

Dear Author/s, the following points are the major concerns for this manuscript.

Summary and overall evaluation:

The manuscript entitled as "Exploring the Relationship Between Gender and Sustainable Development Competencies in Higher Education Institutions: Insights from a Zimbabwean University", contains an interesting idea. It is considerable to value women in academia. However, it is also considerable that if gender equality is so important in academia it may disturb the social set-up as naturally every woman cannot contribute equally to man. It seems that not only in this article but also in overall literature there is over-emphasis on gender equality. This point is raised to understand that if it does not affect other areas then it is good to promote gender participation in academia. And there are many more points which critically needs to be considered in equal participation of gender in academia. Secondly, what are the sustainable development competencies? Apart from this, the literature review is not fresh. Then the manuscript lacks in having solid and convincing research methods. Resultantly, findings, discussion, conclusion and recommendations need revision. Overall the following points are to be considered mindfully.

Areas to be improved:

1. The abstract shows a good picture of the manuscript. However, there are many points need to be addressed. Firstly, it seems that it is just a description. Secondly, the background of the study is missing. Thirdly, which research approach (qualitative or quantitative and more precisely which one) was used. Fourthly, how the data was analyzed. Finally, the length of the abstract seems too lengthy. It needs to be rewritten and condensed. Overall, it has a good picture to present the manuscript.
2. **Introduction** section should introduce the title effectively. For example, why gender equality is necessary for sustainable development and especially with respect to HEIs? Moreover, what are the sustainable development competencies can be critically discussed in the introduction section? Apart from this, what is the main research

question of this study? All these points recall to revisit the introduction section.

3. **Literature Review** section lacks fresh literature on gender equality and SD in higher education institutions. Apart from this, there is no table or figure in literature review. Thus, it needs revision.
4. **Method:** this section is too weak. There is no reference that whom has referred to use which method and why? There is no discussion that which research approach is used and why that approach is used? Moreover, which criteria was used to select the one university? If it is one university then I suggest to use Case study approach and contextually use this approach in this manuscript but adhering to its all requirements. Apart from this, there is a claim that mix-method was used but in fact the detail on it is missing. Moreover, how data was collected? How that data was analyzed and on which principles? All these questions require to completely rewrite the research method section and reanalyze the data.
5. **Results/Findings:** the result section should discuss only results and it should be free from discussion. However, this section may consist of some sub-headings.
6. **Discussion:** It is suggested to keep this section separate from the results.
7. **Conclusion:** This section is too short and show just the description. Thus, it should be rewritten in accordance with the revision of data analysis, findings and discussion.
8. **Recommendations:** This is a qualitative study and the present method of reaching findings is too shallow. It is strongly advised to keep maximum 4 to 5 recommendations that are relevant to findings. The present recommendation section is too long.
9. **References** should be double checked to keep them consistent and appropriate.