

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_131108
Title of the Manuscript:	NARRATIVE ANALYSIS OF ABORIGINAL KNOWLEDGE AS A TOOL FOR LEARNERS’ SOCIALISATION: IMPLICATIONS FOR BEST CHILD-UPBRINGING PRACTICES IN CAMEROON
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This is an interesting article exploring the importance of indigenous knowledge to the development of children in Cameroon. The author(s) have presented a comprehensive explanation of the depth of these indigenous systems and an attempt has been made to frame the explanation with a theoretical grounding. As a review paper, this work would hold value in drawing together contributions from several seminal works to present a single picture of the utility of indigenous knowledge systems in child-rearing in Cameroon. However, structurally and methodologically, the article requires major review before being appropriate for publication.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title suggests a narrative analysis, but this is not explicated as a methodology in the abstract. The title is lengthy and can be reduced to fewer words. The term ‘child-upbringing practices’ does not seem to be the best fit. Perhaps child-rearing is a better term to use here? The title mentions the inclusion of aboriginal knowledge but is referring to cultural practices in Africa. The author seems to be conflating the term ‘aboriginal’ with ‘indigenous’. Whilst there are some scholars that do this, I suggest not using the word ‘aboriginal’ in this study as this typically refers to communities in Australasia. Using the term ‘indigenous’ is less confusing for the reader. If the author feels strongly about using the term ‘aboriginal’, please include a strong justification for this in the manuscript.	
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.	The abstract would benefit from a significant reworking to follow a more traditional format, for example the IMRaD format. What is noticeably missing is a reference to the methodology employed by the authors. It is written “this paper also establishes that this status quo is....” How have you established this? There are also several speculative statements in the abstract that weaken the overall argument and merit of the paper. For example, “it is possible that they are facing extinction” and “it could be maintained that knowing about education...”. The keywords are sparse and incorrectly presented with a colon instead of a comma or semi-colon. Please be consistent in how keywords are presented.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The methodological procedure used in writing this paper is not clear. Please include a section describing the methodological procedures used to undertake this narrative analysis. Furthermore, please revise the overall structure of the paper to clearly demarcate the key sections of a scientifically sound paper. In particular, please separate the methods sections from results, discussion, and conclusions. The introductory sections can be significantly condensed to focus only on the sections/ works salient to your core argument in this paper. Please also include a section clearly contextualising this work in Cameroon specifically.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, several sections are missing needed references. This is especially evident in the introduction which currently has no references. It would be valuable to include some recent articles in this manuscript – much of the cited literature is relatively old. The inclusion of work from Jean Piaget and Lev Vygotsky is not well justified and has not been applied to the context of this work. Please re-consider the value that this discussion has in your overall argument. Please correct referencing errors in reference list – many references are incomplete and inconsistent with the style required for this journal.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Not yet – I suggest working with an editor to correct grammar errors, refine overly long sentences and select more academically appropriate terminology. There is some colloquial language scattered throughout the paper. For example, in the abstract, it is written ‘Through the songs and games children got to know their environment’. Please replace this phrase with more academic terminology and avoid the use of colloquial language. There are other instances of errors of this nature that an editor would be able to support you with.	
Optional/General comments	<p>It is not clear what the value is of the sections on African Traditional Medicine and Medicine Ontologies – these do not appear to contribute to the overall argument of the paper and appear to be inconsistent with the other sections of the paper. A case study is introduced on page 11, but it is not clear where this case study has come from. Please indicate if this is primary data collected by the author (and comment on ethicality around this) or cite the source from which it was taken.</p> <p>The methodological procedures and overall structure of the paper require much work to align the paper to one central argument – the golden thread is not yet clear. The actual narrative analysis is very short, and it is unclear how the paragraphs following this section and linked or related to the analysis.</p> <p>The theoretical framework is only introduced on page 14 – this should appear much earlier if it is to be used to frame the analysis.</p> <p>Please ensure that the conclusion section reads like a conclusion – no new information should be presented. Use this opportunity in the paper to wrap up what you have argued and leave the reader with a clear picture of the key points you want them to remember after reading your paper. The conclusion makes no reference to the narrative analysis promised in the title.</p> <p>The paper appears to read more like a narrative review than a narrative analysis. Consider reworking this as a review paper rather than a research paper.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tracey L. Haselau
Department, University & Country	The Independent Institute of Education, South Africa