

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJARR_120737</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>CLIMATIC CHANGE ADAPTATION STRATEGIES AND ITS EFFECTIVENESS IN RELATION TO BUILDINGS OF AYETORO COMMUNITY, ONDO STATE.</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is valuable for the scientific community as it offers crucial insights into community-based climate change adaptation strategies. Its mixed-methods approach provides a comprehensive understanding of the effectiveness and limitations of these strategies. However, a deeper exploration of their long-term sustainability and broader applicability would enhance its contribution.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a clear overview of the study's objectives, methodology, and findings. However, it could benefit from a more explicit statement of the study's significance or practical implications. Consider adding a brief sentence summarizing the broader implications of the findings for the field or specific stakeholders. This addition would enhance the abstract's completeness and relevance to the scientific community.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are generally well-defined and logically organized, facilitating the reader's understanding of the research process. However, there are a few areas where clarity and coherence could be improved. For instance, ensuring consistent formatting and labeling of subsections throughout the manuscript would enhance readability. Additionally, a more explicit linking of subsections to the main research objectives or hypotheses would strengthen the manuscript's coherence. Overall, while the structure is appropriate, minor revisions to improve clarity and cohesion would be beneficial	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript exhibits scientific rigor and technical soundness through its methodological approach, data analysis methods, and clear theoretical framework. These elements collectively enhance the manuscript's credibility and its potential to advance understanding within its research domain.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. -	The manuscript's references are generally sufficient and up-to-date, contributing to the scholarly foundation of the research. However, incorporating recent publications from the last two to three years could further enrich the literature review and strengthen the manuscript's relevance to current advancements in the field	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Overall, the manuscript shows promise with a well-structured approach and comprehensive literature review. Scientific rigor is evident, but there are minor areas for improvement in clarity and expanding on certain concepts. Adding recent references would enhance the relevance and depth of the study.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Yaregal Tilahun</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mizan-Tepi University, Ethiopia</b>