

Review Form 3

Translated from Indonesian to English - www.onlinedoctranslator.com

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_131258
Manuscript Title:	Gender Dimensions in Plantation Agriculture Roles and Implications: A Critical Review of Cameroon Development Cooperation (CDC) Debundscha Oil Palm Plantations Before and After the Anglophone Crisis
Article Type	Original Research Article

PART 1:Comment

	Reviewer comments Review comments generated or assisted by Artificial Intelligence (AI) are strictly prohibited during peer review.	Author Feedback (Please revise the manuscript and highlight the section in the manuscript. Authors are required to write their feedback here)
Please write a few sentences about the importance of this manuscript to the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be necessary for this section.	This research will provide an important contribution in improving family welfare, especially for female workers in plantations or agriculture. Female workers in plantations are trapped in poverty caused by the feminization of poverty (gender inequality) in accessing resources. It is hoped that this research can also provide policy recommendations in protecting workers, especially female workers, so that they can carry out their obligations to provide breast milk or breastfeed and not experience sexual violence in the workplace.	
Is the title of the article appropriate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate because the discussion examineswell-being and gender dynamics of workers on the Debundscha oil palm plantation in Cameroon, with a focus on changes before and after the Anglophone crisis.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest adding (or removing) some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract must also include the background of the problem so that readers can understand the importance of this research. In addition, the conclusion in the research results does not need to be included, it is sufficient to contain the research results only. So the background, research objectives, methods and research results appear clear and systematic.	
Is this manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.	This study shows clear problems, objectives and research methods. It's just that at the discussion stage the appearance of the interview results is not included so that the data is more on the results of the collection and analysis of quantitative methods. The use of data from the grounded method does not appear in the discussion. In addition, the discussion seems shallow because it has not yet dialogued the findings with the theory used.	
Are the references adequate and up to date? If you have additional reference suggestions, please include them in the review form.	This research uses a critical and liberal and radical feminist perspective. So it would be better to add literature about feminism. In addition, references about research methods should also be added, especially regarding grounded theory and mix methods.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scientific communication?	The language used in this research is easy to understand, but it is not systematic in presenting the arguments so it seems repetitive.	
Optional/Generalcomment		

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)	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yelly Elanda
Department, University & Country	Wijaya Kusuma University, Indonesia