



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_39730
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF CASHEW FARMERS ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE IN SOUTH-WESTERN NIGERIA
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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In a general evaluation the article is well written, clear, objective and presenting the expected standard for scientific writing. The study object is socially and scientifically relevant, given the lack of studies on the adaptation of the rural sector, especially small producers and family producers in face of climate change. The results of the study point out that the evidence of changes comes from the producers' own observation, probably demonstrating a lack of technical support and knowledge transfer between institutions and population (would be interesting for the authors to emphasize and explain better this topic) The methodology is consistent with the results, but I recommend the use of descriptive statistics to better interpretation of the data, including to compare different patterns of response among the study areas. Finally, I felt missed some authors with an international contribution to the theme of adaptation to Climate Change: A. Giddens and M. Pelling; from the reading of these references the authors could make a political discussion about the results.	As suggested, a paragraph was adapted to emphasize the disconnect between the population and available institutions, as evidenced by the study. Bulk of the statistics engaged in the study are quite descriptive in nature. Although more could have been done, we are very much constrained, due to the level of data obtained for the study. As for the comparison of different patterns of response among the study areas, we didn't give much cognisance to that because the focus of the study was not to undertake a comparative analysis. However, the authors consider it a suggestion for further studies. Which we will love to explore in all earnestness. A review of some of the works of the recommended authors was undertaken. By and large, the literatures came across as very informative and relevant to the subject matter. Evidences from the materials were used to buttress some salient points and findings of the study, as recommended.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		