



I. K. Press

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Global Research in Education and Social Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOGRESS_11896
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Buganda's indigenous wisdom of all time: (Totemism, Taboos and Spirituality) and nature conservation</b>
Type of the Article	

**General guideline:**

**This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only based on 'lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer thinks is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://www.ikpress.org/index.php/index/editorial-guideline>



## 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for the scientific community?</b> (Please write a few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>1. Overall, the manuscript appears to be important for the scientific community as it offers insights into how indigenous knowledge can inform contemporary conservation efforts. However, a thorough review of the methodology and empirical evidence presented in the study would be necessary to assess the validity and reliability of the proposed conservation model.</p> <p>2. Its seems suitable as it effectively encapsulates the main focus and objective of the manuscript.</p> <p>3. The abstract provided appears to be incomplete. It outlines the intention of the study and briefly mentions some findings and recommendations but lacks clarity and structure The abstract should provides a clearer overview of the study's objectives, methods, findings, and recommendations, along with appropriate keywords for indexing and searchability</p> <p>4. Overall, this discussion effectively integrates empirical findings with theoretical frameworks and previous literature to support its arguments. This provides valuable insight into the complex relationship between culture, tradition and wildlife conservation in Buganda society. However, further clarification or expansion on certain points can increase the depth of the analysis and contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the topic.</p>	



<b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b>	5. References should be more up to date (last 5 years) 6. Overall, the sentences are clear and grammatically correct. However, there are a few areas where clarity and conciseness could be improved.	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments  1. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b><u>Optional</u></b> comments	Please use grammar/ Ai, to make it better	

## **PART 2:**

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

## **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Alexander Phuk Tjilen
Department, University & Country	Universitas Musamus, Indonesia.