

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_89043
Title of the Manuscript:	Regional, decentralisation and traditional power in Cameroon
Type of the Article	Review

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>This article raises an interesting topic, but the structure of the article and the way it is written are very weak, and in the current form I cannot recommend the article for publication.</p> <p>Here are some tips to improve the quality of the article:</p> <p>Introduction section of an article is one of the most important parts of the article in which the research problem, the importance of the problem, and the approach of the article to address that problem, and the justification of innovation and contribution of the article should be stated by citing references and statistics. The introduction section of this article is very weak and needs to be rewritten. This article has two "section 2", one called Literature Review and the other is the Research Methodology that the order and sectioning of the headline should be corrected throughout the article.</p> <p>In the literature review section, the subject literature is described, while the presentation of content in this section is not purposeful. This section is where authors should present the research hypotheses they are testing. In the first section, i.e., in the introduction section, they should write in detail what the research problem they considered is and why it is important to solve it, and if this problem is not solved, what problems will arise for organizations. The introduction is where the authors should write down what solutions have been offered in the existing literature to solve this problem, and then they should express their proposed solution to address this problem and compare their proposed solution with the solutions in the literature, and finally to justify the innovation of their work.</p> <p>Therefore, the literature review section should be purposeful and presented in a way to support the development of research hypotheses. At the end of the second section, i.e., the literature review, a conceptual model that is tested by statistical analysis should be presented.</p> <p>In the conclusions of the article, in addition to what has been written, the authors should answer the question "So what?". That is, they should state what the new findings of this article are (the findings differ from the quantitative results presented in the section) as well as who (practitioners and / or researchers) and how they can use these findings.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Saeed Nosratabadi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Public Service, Hungary</b>