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| 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.** | This manuscript addresses a significant gap in the education of linguistically handicapped pupils, specifically deaf children, in Cameroon. By analyzing the challenges faced in specialized institutions, the paper provides valuable insight into curriculum rigidity and the need for teacher training in special education. I appreciate the manuscript's relevance to global educational goals and inclusive education, especially in regions like Cameroon, where these topics have been underexplored. However, the manuscript could benefit from more detailed suggestions for policy change or reforms, which would enhance its practical value for educators and policymakers. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title, *"Educating Linguistically Handicapped Pupils in Cameroon: Stakes and Challenges,"* is somewhat suitable but can be made more specific. A suggested alternative could be: *"Challenges and Prospects in Deaf Education: A Case Study of Specialized Schools in Cameroon."* This version emphasizes the focus on deaf education and highlights both the challenges and opportunities, giving a clearer scope of 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 is fairly comprehensive but lacks specific mention of the key findings and proposed solutions. Adding a brief sentence summarizing the research results (i.e., that the curriculum was rigid, and teachers struggled to adapt) it would make it more effective. Additionally, the abstract could highlight the need for better teacher training and curriculum reform, which are central themes of the manuscript. |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, covering essential areas such as curriculum adaptation, teaching skills, and methodology. However, the discussion section could be expanded to include more critical analysis and comparison with international practices. Also, separating policy suggestions into a distinct section could make the manuscript more actionable for educational policymakers. |  |
| **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 sound and provides clear, data-driven insights into the problems facing deaf education in Cameroon. It relies on empirical evidence gathered through interviews, questionnaires, and observations, making its findings reliable. The use of established theories, such as Reigeluth’s Instructional Design Theory, further strengthens its academic foundation. However, the manuscript could benefit from more specific recommendations for the practical implementation of curriculum changes and teacher training programs. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | The references are adequate but could be updated to include more recent studies on inclusive education and deaf education, particularly from the last five years. Incorporating contemporary research on special education policies, especially from similar developing contexts, would provide a stronger comparative framework for the study. |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | * The language is generally suitable for scholarly communication, though there are occasional grammatical inconsistencies and awkward phrasings. A thorough proofreading for clarity and flow is recommended. * Some sections, particularly the methodology, could benefit from additional detail, such as the sampling process or justification for the chosen sample size. |  |
| Optional/General comments | Overall, this manuscript offers valuable insights into the challenges faced by deaf pupils in Cameroon, contributing to the broader discourse on inclusive education. Strengthening the policy recommendations and enhancing the critical discussion would further improve its impact on the scientific community.  This manuscript requires major revisions to improve its clarity, depth, and practical recommendations. While the research is valuable and addresses an important gap in special education in Cameroon, improvements are needed in areas such as the discussion of ethical considerations, the structuring of policy recommendations, and the refinement of the abstract. Additionally, there should be greater emphasis on actionable solutions for curriculum adaptation and teacher training. With these revisions, the manuscript could significantly contribute to the field of inclusive education.  There are no apparent ethical issues in the manuscript. The study appears to have followed standard research protocols, including the use of questionnaires, interviews, and observations. However, it would be beneficial if the manuscript explicitly stated how the researchers obtained consent from participants, especially considering that the study involved minors (deaf pupils). A brief mention of ethical considerations, such as participant consent and confidentiality, could improve the clarity of the research's ethical compliance. |  |
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