



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_34892
Title of the Manuscript:	Uptake of knowledge and technologies for adaptation to climate change in crop production systems in Uganda: A review
Type of the Article	Review Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of **'lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

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

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract should merge with one paragraph Introduction: need analytical review of literature related to the article title. Methodology: Well written Results and Discussion: Okay but too large. It should specific, concise and reduce to two third Conclusion: need to emphasis the most important training needs for urgently consideration References: For references need to follow the journal rules of writing reference. Lack of uniformity. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract has been collapsed into one paragraph The Introduction has been revised and refocused accordingly Methodology – Authors grateful for the reviewer's observation Scrutiny was made into the results and discussion sections in an attempt to reduce them, following the reviewer's suggestion. Our observation is that in the present form, deletion of any part will only damage the completeness of the story of the situation on the ground. We welcome further specific suggestions by the reviewer about which areas in this sections that we can consider for diminishing the manuscript. Fortunately, after restructuring the Introduction and the conclusions, the paper reduced from 31 to 28pages Conclusion – This has been revisited and refocused Reference listing style – Yes there were cases that needed conformity to the style of the journal. We have addressed them variously as required
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		