

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_IJECC_117640
Title of the Manuscript:	A review on Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Agricultural Extension Services in Adapting to Climate Change among Subsistence Farmers
Type of the Article	Review 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>)

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>It is impossible to fully assess the importance of the study as the authors did not mention the number of the documents reviewed and the choice of documents reviewed is not detailed enough.</p> <p>Yes, it is.</p> <p>Not fully, there is no mention what materials are to be reviewed within the study.</p> <p>Yes, they are.</p> <p>The answer is the same as for the question 1.</p> <p>Yes, they are.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it is.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The description of the methodology needs to be improved.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Barbara Wieliczko
Department, University & Country	Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland