

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_98255
Title of the Manuscript:	Climate and agriculture in Côte d'Ivoire: Perception and quantification of the impact of climate change on cocoa production by 2050
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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. It seems to me that the manuscript is important for the scientific community since it tries to establish the impact of climate change on cocoa production by 2050 in Africa.</p> <p>2. I think the title is appropriate</p> <p>3. The summary shows the basic elements of the investigation, or what the summary is pertinent, although it could be improved.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript is adequate. However , the background be included by carrying out a more extensive bibliographical consultation .</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. I believe that it could be enriched and given a scope that is at least correlative and supported.</p> <p>6. The references are not enough; it could be expanded by doing a more recent bibliographic search and this will enrich the document</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language used is understandable and sufficient for most readers to understand the purpose and results of the article.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The location of the following observations is in the word document. these are attached as comments.</p> <p>In which countries? It says "In both countries"</p> <p>What does "j" mean?</p> <p>The same color scale should have been used on the maps.</p> <p>It would be necessary to specify what exactly is meant by parallel coordinates</p> <p>Here a decimal is handled in one case and in the second case two decimals, was it determined differently? It would be necessary to homogenize the number of decimal places of the same variable.</p> <p>This seems to be not very objective. Rich between 20 and 41% and Poor between 36 and 41%. It doesn't seem coherent.</p> <p>Percentage of sand between 14 and 22%, does not match what was previously described?</p> <p>It would be necessary to map the RUs A, B, c and D</p> <p>Would it be necessary to explain in this case what is meant by homogeneity?</p> <p>Separating the words is all together.</p> <p>You have presented three precipitation intervals, which is the correct one?</p> <p>What does the summary column represent? Are they the CVs?</p> <p>Where do these percentages come from? These do not appear in table 2 ?</p> <p>What does "you" and "Pr>t" mean?</p> <p>There is no table 4.</p> <p>More than half of the references (26/46) are older than 10 years.</p>	

PART 2:

	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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hermes Ulises Ramirez Sanchez
Department, University & Country	Universidad De Guadalajara, Mexico