

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_95729
Title of the Manuscript:	Perception of Climate Change Impacts on Livelihoods in Central Mali
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:

(<https://www.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy>)

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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes Yes Yes Yes No Yes</p> <p>1. Usually, the part of introduction will explain the background, significant and research problems of the study. But, such a details are not clear in this study and also author given review of literatures with several incomplete sentences.</p> <p>2. Author has to revise the manuscript to language editing which has to be completed and readable.</p> <p>3. Accurate data is not presented while interpretation being given for each figure.</p> <p>4. Author has to check interpretation for graphical presentation that whether rightly interpreted or not?, Whether accurate data given or not? Whether percentage given for all graphs or not?</p> <p>5. Author need to develop the study with some more suggestions.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Not clear to read. Some in complete sentences are given.	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>1. Accurate data is not presented while interpretation being given for each figure.</p> <p>2. Author has to check interpretation for graphical presentation that whether rightly interpreted or not?, Whether accurate data given or not? Whether percentage given for all graphs or not?</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	T. Amose
Department, University & Country	Madurai Kamaraj University, India