

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	

Review Form 3

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>
<p>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>	<p>This manuscript is valuable to the scientific community because it provides a unique perspective on the intersection of traditional knowledge systems and cognitive development, particularly within the African context. By investigating the pedagogical implications of African traditional medicine, it highlights the importance of indigenous knowledge in shaping critical skills like decision-making, problem-solving, and social competence in adolescents. I appreciate the study's mixed-method approach, which combines both quantitative and qualitative insights, adding depth and credibility to the findings. However, it could benefit from a broader discussion on the integration of traditional and modern medical practices to provide a more comprehensive understanding.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes , the title is suitable</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Abstract of the article is comprehensive and meaningful</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes , structure of the manuscript is appropriate</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its well-structured mixed-methods approach, which integrates both qualitative and quantitative data. The use of recognized tools such as SPSS for quantitative analysis and Atlas.Ti for qualitative coding ensures the reliability and validity of the findings. The inclusion of a pilot study demonstrates an effort to refine the research process, and the sample drawn from multiple villages strengthens the study's generalizability within the specific cultural context of the Oku Subdivision. Furthermore, anchoring the study on Bandura's Social Learning Theory provides a strong theoretical foundation, aligning the research with established cognitive development principles. The statistical rigor, evident in the precise reporting of results (R=0.382, P=0.000), further enhances the scientific correctness of the manuscript</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>the references are sufficient and recent</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article quality is very nice and article suitable for scholarly communications.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. The manuscript would benefit from a more in-depth discussion of how traditional medicine can be integrated into formal education systems, as this would enhance its pedagogical implications. 2. Expanding on the limitations of the study and future research directions would make the manuscript more comprehensive and provide a clearer framework for ongoing research in this area.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kudnar Changadev Kisan
Department, University & Country	Savitribai Phule Pune University, India