



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_30439
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Climate Change Adaptive and Coping Strategies of Women Farmers in Mmaku Mountainous Community Awgu Area Enugu State Nigeria
Type of the 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 (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Line 9. To reduce the effects of climate change Line 18. Also the Government Line 24. The keywords should not be the same as the title. Line 28. Climate change Influences the processes of... Line 56-62. This phrase is very repetitive. Improve targeting, very redundant. I suggest you put it like this in the abstract. Objective. Line 64. Material and methods. Line 80. What is this Harmttan. Line 82. Put Source in the end. Line 90. Write: equation 1. within the text, between parenthesis (equation 1). Line 93. n, do not put. Line 96. In the equation not observed I. Line 108-117. Do not do the calculations in much detail, remember that it is a scientific article.7 Please simplify to the maximum. Line 137-206. In the results and discussion, 99% is results, that is to say that there is nothing of discussion, in that sense, to discuss with other authors if the affirmed by the respondents is true or false. This is a very interesting topic, there is information. Also the citations are very old, place of the last 5 years. Does not discuss with other authors, of similar works. Line 209-223. The conclusions are not discussions, The conclusion is in function of your objective.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	You will have the same number of conclusions, according to the number of objectives. Its conclusion has to be in function to its respondents, in function of the results presented in the tables. Line 225-246. Problem in the article: At least 20 bibliographic references are accepted. 90% of them, have to be scientific articles. Of works published in the last 5 years or more. Always the references give much scientific value to the work done. Obs. Recommend, what types of research are important to perform based on your results in the future.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Carlos Abanto Rodriguez</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Ucayali, Institute for Research of the Peruvian Amazon-IIAP, Peru</i>