

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_99562</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A SCALE TO MEASURE ATTITUDE OF FARMERS TOWARDS INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT MEASURES FOR CLIMATE CHANGE</b>
Type of the Article	<b>ORIGINAL RESEARCH (ARTICLE)</b>

### 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> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>The manuscript appears to be important to the needs of the scientific community, especially for the need of the study area.</b>  <b>The title is appropriate</b>  <b>The abstract has not been clearly communicated. The major findings have not been stated in the abstract.</b>  <b>The structuring of the sections and sub-sections can be better organised. For example no clear section on the presentation of results or general discussion</b>  <b>From what has been presented, I can say the manuscript is correct.</b>  <b>The references are inadequate for a study of such significance. Some references are rather too old (see Thurstone &amp; Chave. (1929)). There is also an inconsistency in the referencing style. This needs to be harmonized.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The quality of language is adequate but can be improved as pointed out in the main work, as significant grammatical errors have been pointed out. This can be achieved by carefully proof reading through the entire manuscript.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article seems quite important especially in the context of where the knowledge shown can be applied. If possible, I would like to see the corrected version before final publication.	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Vremudia Wekpe</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria</b>