

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_123921
Title of the Manuscript:	MAINSTREAMING INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE INTO CLIMATE CHANGE POLICIES IN CAMEROON
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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 significant for the scientific community as it highlights the critical role of indigenous knowledge in climate change adaptation strategies, particularly among marginalized pastoralist communities like the Mbororo in Cameroon. It underscores the need for integrating traditional practices into formal policy frameworks to enhance resilience against environmental challenges. By documenting the specific challenges faced by these communities, the manuscript contributes valuable insights into the intersection of socio-cultural dynamics and environmental governance. I appreciate this manuscript for its thorough examination of local knowledge systems and its call for inclusive policymaking, which is essential for fostering sustainable development in vulnerable regions.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>The title of the article appears suitable as it reflects the core focus on integrating pastoralist indigenous knowledge into climate change adaptation strategies. It captures the essence of the research, emphasizing both the cultural context of the Mbororo community and the broader implications for climate policy. However, if there are specific aspects of the study that are particularly highlighted in the findings or discussions, incorporating those elements into the title could enhance clarity and impact. Overall, it effectively conveys the manuscript's theme and scope.</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>Yes, it is good and can be adopted</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript seem appropriate, as they logically guide the reader through the topic from the introduction to the final findings. The division into clear sections—such as the adoption of short-distance transhumance, challenges in integrating indigenous knowledge, discussions on mismatches in policy, and conclusions—helps in organizing complex information. Each subsection addresses specific aspects of the study, facilitating a comprehensive understanding of the issues at hand. Overall, the structure appears well thought out, promoting clarity and coherence in presenting the research findings.</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 demonstrates scientific robustness through its comprehensive use of qualitative methodologies to explore the integration of indigenous knowledge systems in climate change adaptation among Mbororo pastoralists. It effectively combines empirical data, such as interviews and community surveys, with established theoretical frameworks, ensuring a well-rounded analysis. The clear identification of both internal and external challenges faced by the Mbororo community adds depth to the discussion and highlights the complexity of integrating traditional practices into national policies. Additionally, the manuscript critically engages with existing literature, providing a solid foundation for its findings and recommendations, which enhances its technical soundness.</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 in the manuscript appear to provide a solid foundation, but it's essential to assess their recency and relevance in the context of ongoing research in climate change adaptation and indigenous knowledge systems. While the manuscript cites foundational works, it may benefit from incorporating more recent studies (from the last five years) that focus on similar themes, particularly those that discuss the integration of indigenous knowledge into national policies or contemporary climate adaptation strategies.</p> <p>Consider including additional references such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) reports on indigenous knowledge and 	

Review Form 3

	<p>climate adaptation.</p> <p>2. Recent articles from journals like "Climate Policy" or "Environmental Science & Policy" that specifically address the role of indigenous practices in climate resilience.</p> <p>3. Case studies on indigenous communities in other regions facing similar challenges, which could provide comparative insights.</p> <p>Updating the reference list with these sources can enhance the manuscript's relevance and ensure it reflects the latest developments in the field.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, with clear and coherent writing throughout. The manuscript effectively conveys complex ideas and research findings, making it accessible to its intended audience. However, there may be occasional grammatical or stylistic issues that could be refined for greater clarity and professionalism.</p> <p>Editing for conciseness, enhancing sentence structure, and ensuring consistent terminology would further improve the overall quality. Overall, with some revisions, the manuscript can meet the standards expected in academic publications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript presents a compelling examination of the integration of Mbororo pastoralists' indigenous knowledge into climate change adaptation strategies in Cameroon. It effectively highlights the rich ecological knowledge possessed by the Mbororo community and identifies the significant challenges they face in policy integration. The use of qualitative methods and detailed interviews adds depth to the findings, providing a robust foundation for the discussion.</p> <p>However, the manuscript could benefit from clearer connections between traditional knowledge and scientific practices, especially regarding potential synergies. Additionally, incorporating more recent studies on indigenous knowledge systems and climate adaptation could strengthen the arguments made. Overall, the research is valuable and contributes meaningfully to the discourse on climate change adaptation and indigenous rights.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Martin Otundo Richard
Department, University & Country	Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya