

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</a>
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.	In my opinion, the paper is relevant to recent global geopolitical shifts as it sheds lights on the Cameroon's strategic position and shifting of alliances with major powers. However, paper could enhance its relevance with a stronger linkage between current alliance of Russia and Cameroon as discussing with examples and projects that helped Russian presence on withdrawal of French forces.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I think title is quite clear and accurately reflecting the focus of the paper; I don't want it to be changed.	
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.	Yes, abstract has provided good overview however, it can be improved by mentioning the key findings. Moreover, highlighting the significance of those findings e.g. manuscripts contribution to field would be important.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Methodology claims the paper would be based on thematic analysis; I have observed that methodology didn't explain what themes author has proposed and is going to further explore in the later analysis. I have observed following 5 themes to be part of this paper.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Political and diplomatic Relations</li><li>2. Defence and Security Cooperation</li><li>3. Economic and Resource Partnership</li><li>4. Cultural and Educational Exchanges</li><li>5. Broader Int. Implications</li></ol> <p>After listing the themes, briefly explain how these themes have evolved over time within the context of Cameroonian-Russian relations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>→ Discussing the historical context for each theme will provide a framework for the analysis. For instance, you could note how the end of the Cold War altered the diplomatic landscape, leading to a focus on pragmatic cooperation rather than ideological alignment., and then further exploring each of themes in analysis will provide a better and clearer insights.</li><li>→ Conclude with a brief overview of how the final analysis will synthesize these themes. This could involve comparing past and present dynamics, assessing the implications for future relations, and drawing conclusions based on the thematic analysis.</li><li>→ Paper could be well structured with discussing methodology (<i>research approach, dataset sources used, primary and secondary sources, thematic framework</i>); Results (<i>Thematic Evolution</i>); Final Analysis (<i>Drawing Conclusions</i>)</li></ul>	
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.	Scientifically, I think the manuscript is sound; however, Conclusion can be further improved as the paper lacks critical analysis, limitations of methodology, future implications.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, references are well-documented cover the most of the events.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, I think that's fine.	
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Khizra Anwaar
Department, University & Country	University of Sargodha, Pakistan