

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting.</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ AJEBA_96296</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Fear Message and Adoption of Barrier Measures: A Study of COVID 19 in the Cameroonian Population</b>
Type of the 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.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<p>I have gone through the manuscript several times and confess that I may not be the right person to review the manuscript. I would recommend that the manuscript is reviewed by at least two experts in <b>Social science.</b></p>	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (es Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title).</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes as it addresses an issue very debatable in the scientific world today.</p> <p>Not very clear. It should clearly indicate what is the intension of the study, which it does not. The intension as I read through was to assess the efficacy of fear messaging in the adoption of COVID19 measures in Cameroon. But the title as it statned is vague it does not clearly indicate the link between. A better title could have been "Efficacy of fear messaging in the adoption of Barrier Measures for COVID19 in Cameroon"</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The manuscript is missing clear statement of the objectives. It jumps from Hypothesis to methodology but misses what it intends to achieve.</p> <p>Yes with the gaps identified above</p> <p>The citation of the references in the literature review does not allow or facilitate access to the cited articles and makes to very difficult to validate the statements. For example Storey et al 2014; Salvin et al 2007 and Jansen et al 2008 and many others do tot allow clear identification of the publication. Searching for the article using these wordings bring a long list of the author's publication of the same year and makes it cumbersome to identify which one is the correct one. The list of citations at the bottom of the study does not include most of the citations in the Literature review.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Yes with minor edits</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>I feel like I may not be the best person to review this manuscript and recommend that at least two Social Science experts should review the manuscript before its publication. I am submitting my comments but declare that it has been a difficult manuscript to review.</p> <p>Given the missing objectives, citation method that does not allow easy access to cited publications in the literature review and unclear definition of the variables and how they were selected. Find additional comments in the attached manuscript.</p> <p>It might be that in the eyes of a social scientist the grading would be rated as Minor Revisions and for this I would insist on having at least Two social scientists to review this manuscript.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Andrew Yona Kitua</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Uniter Republic of Tanzania</b>