

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_97243
Title of the Manuscript:	Raising Citizen's Consciousness of Climate Change Challenges and Adaptation in 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:

(<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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Ad 1) An interesting question followed here – that, as is typical for good research, immediately raises many more questions. We need to correct numerous statements that imply scientific evidence but need more cautious wording. Also, additional information is required on the questionnaire sample taken, about the evaluation of those 269 returned and certain limitations need to be given as to the interpretation of results. Also, more context, e.g. comparison with another country's population (e.g., EU country) would help to understand the meaningfulness of findings.</p> <p>Ad 2) Yes but could be improved by being a bit more indicative of specific question and results</p> <p>Ad 3) Yes but could be more concise, and it requires some structural improvement, e.g., to mention Nigeria at an earlier point as the country of focus</p> <p>Ad 4) Yes although might benefit from additional or more precise sub titles</p> <p>Ad 5) Some statements are over expressed, there are quite some generalized statements that make the article seem less important or doubtful. In general, the focus here is on the intensity of media coverage, which is a fair point. But in order to direct the population to a change to climate friendly behaviour – it requires more than only to intensify the communication channels for learning: The quality of information is important, the direct relationship between behaviour and climatic results needs to be fully understood, the chains of action and causality, etc. Also, the conclusions or discussion would benefit from comparison with other population/ other country. Finally, the interviewed group should be specified better, e.g. the meaning of "school" as communication channel will only be useful for a certain percentage of population. What happened to those 1,000 surveyed people who did not return (roughly 75%!) – and why did they not, was there any follow up? Any reasons given?</p> <p>Ad 6) Yes for the topic chosen they seem sufficient. Widening the scope, e.g. by additional comparison would require additional references.</p> <p>Additional Comment: The introduction section is very extensive, with many very helpful references and useful information given. Just it is a bit lengthy and with some excursions that do not seem urgently needed in this context, e.g. the very extensive examples given for climate change in China and Nigeria, although explained very well and certainly leading to the topic, could be a bit shorter.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes very good language	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The article may be markedly improved if authors could at least introduce some reflection of the CONTENTS of the climate change information, particularly in terms of direct workable instructions for certain or all parts of the population. The way it is written now is giving too strong impression as if the QUANTITY of outreach alone would contribute to more awareness of climate relevant behaviour.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lorenz Huebner
Department, University & Country	Germany