

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

Habib Joubert

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Reviewer's comment to author(s)

Dear Author(s),

The study aims to examine the importance of empowering women in leadership and management positions to maintain gender equality in the Sidama region.

Some of the improvements I propose are the following:

1. In the introduction, the relevance of your topic from a research, regulatory, and practical perspective should be further structured. Motivation and value added of your study in comparison to prior research are not clear to me. You mentioned that yours is the first study. But why is it important to conduct this study from a content view? Please also motivate your setting (Sidama region)- Why is it important to rely on this setting?
2. The literature review section is missed. You only include a few studies in the introduction section without any reflections on prior literature reviews. This is not satisfying. What are the differences or similarities between your chosen studies? This would be really necessary. I also wonder why any theory is cited; agency theory (Jensen and Meckling, 1976), resource dependency theory (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978), critical mass theory (Kanter, 1977a, b), among others. I think this is a bit too much.
3. The article contributions that appear in the introduction section are very general and can be applied to other types of work. It is essential that authors reinforce their contributions by showing exactly how they can help the various stakeholders (or else they withdraw from the introduction and leave only what they have in the conclusions);
4. Hypotheses must be placed after the literature review for each research question that they intend to answer. In this version, the literature review is missed. The paper has little to do with this area, and it is a big limit.
5. Regarding the research design section, the choice of the sample period, as well as the selected variables, is not clear. What was the theoretical/practical argument?
6. The amount of controls is not convincing. Please explain in detail the choice and include a robust amount of controls. Please elaborate more on this choice.

7. Sample selection is rather not clear, please show a precise description from initial to final sample and provide a table on these issues.

8. Tables haven't a scientific style.

9. A section with an effective discussion of the results is missing. More needs to be done to connect the relevant theoretical backdrop to the underlying purpose of the study. In particular, the significance and originality of the paper needs much argumentation and persuasion so that it is clear how the paper not only builds theory but also connects to practice in significant ways.

10. I miss a separate section with detailed interpretation, contributions, and precise research recommendations for your paper. This is needed.

11. Please also explain the managerial and financial implications of your research.

Regarding all the above remarks, I recommend a major revision.

I hope that my recommendations are useful to you. I wish you all the best for your paper.