

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_98528
Title of the Manuscript:	SITUATION OF THE PRACTICE OF MOTHER TONGUES IN CAMEROON AND PROPOSAL OF METHODS AIMED AT FACILITATING ITS LEARNING
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The topic of this manuscript is of significance in the area of mother tongue education</p> <p>2. The title could be changed into: The practice of mother tongue used in Cameroon and its implications</p> <p>3. The abstract of this article is not comprehensive to me. The author may want to present research methods used to explore the findings of the research.</p> <p>4. The structure and subsections is appropriate, but each section was numbered in a way like "III-1", which combined Roman letters and numbers. This looks a little bit odd for me.</p> <p>5. In terms of the methods used in the study, I do not think they are used scientifically; at least the author did not describe the research methods clearly. From the methods section, the author mentioned tests, interview, and observation. Unfortunately, the author did not report clearly the content of the tests, how the tests were implemented, the interview protocol, the content of the questionnaire, the observation protocol and how participants were observed. While there is a section titled "material", I still did not know what materials were used and for what purposes. All of these confusions made the results not convincing enough.</p> <p>Also, the research questions are structured in a little bit messy. They were not organized in a scientific way and having some irrelevant statements to research questions.</p> <p>5. The references look good to me.</p> <p>6. The results reported in III-3 is not clear to reader for several reasons: 1. How were the participants tested? 2. How can we relate the results of learning tests to some practice of using mother tongue such as bonus? 3. How each approach was used for participants? These approaches may be clear to authors but not to readers who are outside of the Cameroon context.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language itself reads understandable for me, but the arrangement of the sentences i.e. the structure of some paragraphs (e.g. methods) is a little bit messy to me. This made me difficult to grasp the purpose of some paragraphs.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. The authors may want to sort out their research questions and reorganize their results according to research questions.</p> <p>2. More importantly, the authors need to provide detailed information regarding how each type of data were collected and also in organized way.</p> <p>3. Proportions should be marked in each table, which shows more meaningful information from the results.</p>	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Xueyan Hu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Foreign Languages, China Three Gorges University, China</b>