



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL  
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: **“Gender Justice in Ethiopia: Governance Gaps and Policy Effectiveness”**

**Submitted: 14 March 2026**

**Accepted: 26 May 2026**

**Published: 31 May 2026**

Corresponding Author: Kebede Geneti Feyissa

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n14p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mondira Dutta  
Jawaharlal Nehru University, India

Reviewer 2: Salwa Alinat  
Open University, Israel

### ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Mondira Dutta	
University, Country: Retired Professor, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, INDIA	
Date Manuscript Received: 19 March 2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 26 March 2026
Manuscript Title: Gender Justice in Ethiopia: Performances, Determinants, Challenges, and Policy Recommendations	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0370/26	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

### Evaluation Criteria:

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Rating Result</b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear, and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The title is somewhat lengthy and could be sharpened. Consider, “Gender Justice in Ethiopia: Governance Gaps, and Policy Effectiveness”</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Although the abstract effectively summarizes methodology, key findings, and recommendations but it is dense and could be slightly condensed for clarity. The entire methodology need not be specified under abstract. The objectives could be consolidated into</i>	

<i>broader thematic categories to improve readability. Some redundancy in phrasing like, “to evaluate the effect...” has been repeated too many times. Literature Review is somewhat descriptive rather than analytical. It has limited critical engagement with competing theories or debates. It needs to be thematically presented. Consolidate into 4 to5 broader objectives for sharper focus.</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Fairly good</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>The Sampling strategy lacks a rationale and clarity in integration. Combination of probability and non-probability methods may introduce bias. Measurement of key constructs (e.g., “self-readiness”) needs clear operationalization. Over-reliance on Likert-scale perception data for complex structural issues. There is limited discussion of Ethical considerations and Field constraints. The study needs to provide clearer justification for mixed sampling, strengthen conceptual-operational linkages and add limitations of methodology. Some of the formulae and computation data ought to be covered as appendix and not within the text.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>The Interpretation sometimes becomes descriptive rather than analytical. There is heavy reliance on means without deeper comparative insight. Regression coefficients are reported but, Standardized coefficients (<math>\beta</math>) and effect sizes could be better emphasized. Limited critical interrogation of causality vs correlation. It requires a more deep analytical discussion explaining why certain variables dominate and the interactions between variables. It should include theoretical reflection alongside statistical results</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>The conclusions are overly long and repetitive in parts. The key insights could be more sharply synthesized. It lacks a strong theoretical or conceptual takeaway. Condense into 4–5 key takeaway arguments. Add a clear concluding insight (e.g., governance vs culture debate)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>References ought to be in APA style. Only selected references be included that are quoted in the text.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	-
Accepted, minor revision needed	-
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	-

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Although the manuscript is substantively strong and policy-relevant, with robust empirical grounding and significant potential for publication, however, it requires some major revisions in order to usher in

- Conceptual clarity
- Analytical depth
- Structural coherence

- Conciseness

Most importantly the tables 1-5 are inarticulate and the diagrammatic representations of figures are distorted. Once revised, the paper would undoubtedly make a valuable contribution to the literature on gender justice and public policy.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

### ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the allotted time so we can provide the authors with timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes a peer-review procedure based on the scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not on perceived impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are with the publisher, and the data can be used for research purposes.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Salwa Alinat Abed	
University, Country: The Open University of Israel	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/3/26	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/3/26
Manuscript Title: Gender Justice in Ethiopia: Performances, Determinants, Challenges, and Policy Recommendations	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: ok	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper is available in the "review history" of the paper: ok	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: ok	

### Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Rating Result</b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The title is descriptive and aligns perfectly with the research framework. It clearly identifies the geographical focus (Ethiopia), the core subject (Gender Justice), and the paper's structural flow (Performances, Determinants, Challenges, and Recommendations).</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
The abstract is exemplary. It provides a concise yet comprehensive summary including the theoretical framework (integrated model), the methodology (mixed methods, N=1,582), key statistical findings (beta coefficients and R <sup>2</sup> ), and the primary conclusions. It effectively serves as a standalone summary of the entire study.	

<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The overall language is of a high academic standard. However, there are minor punctuation inconsistencies and some repetitive phrasing in the literature review section. A final professional proofreading would polish the transition between the quantitative results and the qualitative discussion.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(The methodology section is a strength of this paper. The author clearly justifies the "pragmatist-critical" philosophical foundation and provides detailed transparency regarding sample size determination (using Cochran and Yamane formulas), sampling techniques, and data collection instruments (7-point Likert scale). The use of Cronbach's alpha for reliability adds significant rigor.)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(The presentation of results is robust. The author effectively integrates primary survey data with secondary administrative data (e.g., from the Ministry of Labor and Skills), which provides a "real-world" validation of the perceived gender gaps. The statistical outputs (ANOVA, Regression) are interpreted correctly and support the research hypotheses.)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><i>(The conclusions are well-grounded in the findings. The author successfully connects the data back to the theoretical concepts (Glass Ceilings/Walls). However, the policy recommendations, while comprehensive, could be more prioritized to guide practitioners on which intervention (e.g., local governance vs. sociocultural change) should take precedence.)</i></p> <p><i>The manuscript presents a robust internal analysis of Ethiopia; however, it lacks a transnational African perspective. Incorporating the sources above would allow the author to discuss whether the identified 'system-wide challenges' (such as the Glass Cliff and Glass Escalator) are unique to the Ethiopian federal-ethnic structure or are symptomatic of a wider regional struggle to translate political 'critical mass' into substantive socio-economic justice. This addition would elevate the paper from a local case study to a significant contribution to African Gender Studies.</i></p> <p><i>For more information See:</i></p> <p><i>Yacob-Haliso, O., &amp; Falola, T. (Eds.). (2021). The palgrave handbook of african women's studies (Vol. 8). Palgrave Macmillan.</i></p> <p><i>Kolovich, M. L. L., &amp; Newiak, M. M. (2024). Gender equality and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa. International Monetary Fund.</i></p> <p><i>Onditi, F., &amp; Odera, J. (2017). Gender equality as a means to women's empowerment? Consensus, challenges, and prospects for the post-2015 development agenda in Africa. African Geographical Review, 36(2), 146-167.</i></p> <p><i>Amahazion, F. (2023). Gender Inequality in Ethiopia: A Critical Overview. The Palgrave Handbook of Global Social Problems, 1-24.</i></p>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The bibliography is extensive and up to date, citing key international bodies (UN, World Bank, OECD) alongside seminal gender theorists (Kabeer, Walby, Eagly). The references reflect a deep understanding of both global gender discourse and the specific Ethiopian context.)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	+
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

1. The manuscript would benefit significantly from a comparative African perspective. While the Ethiopian data is rich, contextualizing these findings within the broader Sub-Saharan trends (e.g., comparing Ethiopia's performance with regional leaders like Rwanda or neighboring IGAD countries) would clarify whether these challenges are unique to the Ethiopian federal structure or reflective of a wider continental trend in gender policy implementation
2. Prioritization of Recommendations: While the seven recommendations are all valid, consider categorizing them into Short-term/Technical (e.g., benchmarking) and Long-term/Structural (e.g., sociocultural transformation) to enhance the practical utility for policymakers.
3. Qualitative Depth: While the quantitative data is very strong, adding a few direct quotes from the qualitative interviews could provide a more "human" perspective on the sociocultural barriers mentioned, such as the "glass cliff" experiences.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**