

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_125142
Title of the Manuscript:	EMERGENCE OF AFRICAN TRADITIONAL MEDICINE: UNDERSTANDING THE LEARNING PROCESS AND PEDAGOGIC IMPLICATIONS FOR OKU LEARNERS OF THE NORTH WEST REGION OF CAMEROON
Type of the Article	Original research

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>This study aims to investigate the impact of traditional medicine on adolescent cognitive development in the Oku Subdivision. The research is significant due to the limited existing studies in this area. However, the introduction section could be improved by using clearer language and more concise sentences. Additionally, while subcontents are present, specific objectives are missing, which is essential for a well-structured manuscript.</p> <p>Furthermore, the methodology section requires substantial revision, with a more in-depth discussion and the inclusion of a conclusion section</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Learning African Traditional Medicine: A Case Study of Oku Learners in Cameroon	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstraction section needs to be revised based on the feedback, as it currently focuses too much on background and methodology and lacks sufficient results.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsection and structure, particularly in the introduction and methodology, are not well-suited.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	As previously noted, the introductory section requires revision to reduce its breadth and eliminate unnecessary jargon. It should be limited to 2-2.5 pages. The methodology section is deficient in its lack of description regarding the study area, the number of participants, the sampling techniques employed, and the data analysis methods utilized. The results or findings should be presented above the corresponding tables. The discussion section is narrow in focus, with an inadequate number of citations and a complete absence of a concluding statement.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited in the discussion section are not sufficient and latest.	
Minor REVISION comments	It is somewhat good	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Admasu Moges
Department, University & Country	Debre Berhan University, Ethiopia