



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_27070
Title of the Manuscript:	Climate change resilience of smallholders on Guatemala Highlands
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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	The author has a scientifically sound argument and has brought some significant knowledge about resilience and climate change. The use of latent class analysis is appropriate given he used both continuous and categorical data. This tends to give the paper sufficient rigor to qualify as a scientific investigation. However, I think the author should bring out distinct differences between the more resourced and less resourced farmers as their different adaptive capacities. Author should consider all the three distinct capacities in developing and later indexing or measuring resilience. These could include adaptive capacity which was discussed, the absorptive (looking at the entire Guatemala highlands in its entirety and transformative capacities (defining the context and how that context is also impacts on climate change resilience) Looking at the analysis and background information, I see your focus on human capital and climate change perceptions and think this could also have been basis for formulation of your objectives as well as the hypotheses. Materials and methods Line 48-70 appears like a literature review, which is good but misplaced. Please consider moving it onto a separate section on literature Review Or add it on Introduction	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	according to this journal. Removing that part will make that section clearer. Notably section a sampling design which is replicable and the inclusion of Latent Class Analysis makes it more appropriate. Results The results section is well articulated with some level of significance based on Latent Class and perception. The discussion has taken note of the statistical analyses in the results which is a plus and this discussion is reflected in the conclusions However, the discussion is slightly weakened by lack of referencing and comparison with other authors. This is a critical area, which needs to be addressed. Consider looking at any of the following publications and many others: <i>Bhawan Singh and Marc J. Cohen, 2014, Climate change resilience, The case of Haiti, University of Montreal</i> <i>Lisa F. Schipper & Lara Langston a F. Schipper & Lara. 2015, A comparative overview of resilience measurement frameworks, Working Paper.</i> The conclusions are not wayward and have a direct link to the data and results, which is very good.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Shorten your sentences so that they are clearer to the reader.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Your paper has a number of unexplained acronyms. Please consider adding a section on that or writing them in full when first used.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Matsvange Diego</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>National University Of Science and Technology (NUST), Zimbabwe</i>