



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_38850
Title of the Manuscript:	Community in climate disaster vulnerability and environmental sustainability: A Botswana perspective
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 (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	1. Title is not self-explanatory. By reading the title, readers will not have any idea what would be in the following sections. I would strongly suggest to rephrase the title. 2. No hypothesis or key questions of the research is given. 3. Not a single reference cited in the 'introduction' and "methodology" sections. No literature review has been given. There is not proper reference system followed. 4. One reference is cited in 15 times in the 'findings' section of the manuscript, which is unusual. 5. No standard methodology for data analysis has been followed. There is no any statistical analysis conducted except percentages. There is no mention whether those percentages are significantly different or not. 6. No definition or concept of some technical words mentioned in the manuscript given. For instance, climate disaster vulnerability, environment, sustainability, etc. Definition of drought is given in the findings section, which looks odd. 7. Abstract is not concise and poorly written. Findings in the abstract section are weak, does not give any strong message. 8. Poor methodology. No statistical tools used. Why 3,567 respondents and why not less or more? No statistical logic given. 9. Lines from 101 to 120 are a literature review, which is under Findings section. There are many instances like this. Need a thorough revision. 10. Study area description is missing. Torrential rainfall has been mentioned, but the amount has not been given anywhere. There are many examples such as this. 11. Conclusions are not in line with the research objectives and findings. 12. Grammar editing is needed. There are many grammatical errors. 13. Many statements are given without any source (one example, Line 124; 'Climate change requires pre-planning and defining roles and responsibilities of HH and communities'... what is the source? The 'findings' section does not support this. 14. Structure of the manuscript (Titles and sub-titles) could be restructured.	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Avoid duplicate words such as Aims/Objectives, Findings/Expected outcomes, risks/hazards.	
Optional/General comments	1. Add recommendations for future studies.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shesh Kanta Kafle
Department, University & Country	Sudan