

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_88645
Title of the Manuscript:	Good Neighbourliness in Cameroon: A logistic analysis of determinants
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.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>We kindly recommend to improve the abstract with the utility to read such an article... doesn't answer the why question. What is the relevance of the study to the international research community?</p> <p>Very good research methodology, but the results are not very well explained, e.g. the author uses some classification between good and bad neighbours, but without any explanation and relation to the obtained data.</p> <p>The author mentioned that "the Chi-square statistic allows us to affirm that the explanatory variables of the model are globally significant", but we wonder how was the global significance established?</p> <p>Moreover, the author ends the article with a must-do policy of the government "Monitor the functioning of the religious organisations..." even if the paper's subject was the good neighbourliness in Cameroon based on individual variables and not institutional ones.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	The author's recommendation is to decentralise power for reducing corruption, but it is already proven in previous studies that this will lead to the development of local corruption. Which are the fundamentals to sustain such a measure? Did the author take into account the limits of such a measure?	
Optional/General comments	No need to have an abbreviation list just for one, it can be transferred to the first time mentioned within the article.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Carausan Mihaela Victorita
Department, University & Country	National University of Political Studies and Public Administration, Romania