

[Review Form2](#)

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Book Name: | An Overview of Literature, Language and Education Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_BPR_2588 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | CRITICAL DIMENSIONS OF STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN CAMEROON HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS |
| Type of the Article | Book chapter |

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | The manuscript is fundamentally flawed. The author failed to highlight a clear research gap, problem statement and aim of the study. The basis of the manuscript is flawed. The manuscript is too generic and does not meet the requirements of a scientific paper or of this journal. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes | |
| 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. | No, please refer to the journal for abstract guidelines. | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | No, the structure of the manuscript is not appropriate. | |
| 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 author failed to provide constructive arguments. Literature review quality 50%: Superficial review with minimal critical analysis, and gaps or connections are ignored. Relevance to research questions 15%: Fails to demonstrate relevance to research questions/objectives. Clarity and cohesion 15%: Poorly organised and difficult to follow. Integration of sources 15%: Poor integration of sources, with little support for arguments. Overall presentation 5%: Presentation is incoherent and lacks adherence to citation styles. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. = | Old references and poor referencing. | |

Review Form2

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Poor grammar, Please get an English language editor. | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

PART 2:

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment <i>(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)</i> |
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| Name: | Dickson Mdhlose |
| Department, University & Country | South Africa |