

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_126579
Title of the Manuscript:	The Evolution of Cameroonian Cooperation with the Soviet Union and the Russian Federation: A Historical and Geopolitical Analysis
Type of the Article	Review 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)
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.	The research paper provides a comprehensive historical overview of Cameroon's shifting alliances from French to Russian influence, detailing economic and military cooperation and cultural exchanges. It addresses contemporary issues like the Russia-Ukraine conflict and internal conflicts such as the Anglophone crisis. The paper situates these relations within Russia's broader strategy in Africa, challenging Western influences and contributing to global power dynamics discourse.	Accepted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	Accepted
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 of the research paper is well-structured and provides a clear overview of the study's focus, historical context, and methodology. However, there are several areas where it could be improved to enhance clarity, comprehensiveness, and alignment with academic standards: The abstract does not explicitly state the research questions or objectives. The abstract should include a brief summary of the key findings or conclusions of the study.	Improved
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	Accepted
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.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive historical context, rigorous methodology, and multidimensional analysis, use of relevant data, contemporary relevance, and scholarly engagement. However, While the paper cites various historical sources and analyses, it appears to rely heavily on existing literature without presenting original research findings or primary data analysis. This limits the manuscript's contribution to the field. The paper presents facts and historical timelines but lack critical engagement with the sources.	My thesis work is the primary data and don't want to share them until after defense
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	Accepted
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	Accepted
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The figure 1 used to show Cameroon Scholarship Students Awarded by Cameroon and Russia Federation should be used in the section on Educational and Cultural Exchanges	Improved

Review Form 3

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