

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Abstract. It is recommended that authors review the rules regarding the maximum number of characters to be used. In the same way, I believe that it could help to briefly include the most important results achieved in the research.</li><li>2. Introduction and Literature review. In my opinion, the introduction is too short and does not correctly delimit the objective of the research work. It would be convenient to make clear at this point the specific objectives of the work and the way to reach them.</li><li>3. The author should explain more clearly the importance and relevance of his research and anticipate the potential benefits of this research.</li><li>4. It is not clear what the purpose of this research is and what methods were used to perform the scientific analysis. I think it would be appropriate to write a brief introduction, albeit. Because it is not entirely clear now what this article is about.</li><li>5. I would recommend forming and highlighting the discussion part.</li><li>6. In my opinion, the authors lack deeper discussions and insights in analyzing the problems.</li><li>7. Link the conclusions to the results in more detail.</li></ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### **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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Dalia Perkumienė
Department, University & Country	Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania