

Review Form2

Book Name:	Current Progress in Arts and Social Studies Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2490
Title of the Manuscript:	Dynamics between Regional Integration and Informal Cross Border Trade and Its Applicability: The Case of Cameroon and Equatorial Guinea
Type of the Article	Book chapter

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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I like the manuscript as it presents a unique perspective on economic integration and ICBT. However, there are a lot of ideas in the paper which can be streamlined. Thus, the author(s) can improve the manuscript to be more focused. The knowledge gap or problem that the paper addresses should be felt within the introduction. The author(s) can include a paragraph immediately after the introduction about the aims/objectives of the study. The author consulted historical literature, which is ok, I believe there is more recent literature published 2015 and above that can be reviewed as well to benefit the paper to add value to the existing body of knowledge. .	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Dynamics between Economic Integration and Informal Cross Border Trade and Its Applicability: The Case of Cameroon and Equatorial Guinea. This is because ICBT is not well articulated in the paper. If the author wishes to retain regional Integration then, he/she can explain that in context of the study is referring to economic integration (Customs Union) since it's the line of thought reflected in the paper	
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.	Based on the improvements author will have made, there are some strong points author will find interesting to include in abstract	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	There are improvements that the author can consider which are highlighted green in the manuscript	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The author's use of grounded theory approach is justified thought process of which findings from data collected where presented. However, a little more discussion can be made on how these findings explain the patterns and relationships or dynamics observed in economic integration and ICBT.Also theories like customs union theory and the dynamic effects analysis can be reflected upon during these discussions. So that the paper does not seem to be disjointed but rather sections complementing each other.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Author(s)referred to relevant literature though most is not recent. The Author(s) can endeavour to review more most recent available literature at least from 2015 so that the study is also informed by current development events in area of study.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is fine. Though, use of personal names of politicians, and government technocrats can be minimised to improve objectivity since the users of the research product will include those outside the geographical focus of the study (Cameroon and Equatoria Guinea). The pan Africanist statements of blame on colonialism can also be neutralised.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ronald Nsubuga
Department, University & Country	Uganda