

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>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript would be important for scientific community. The manuscript would be important for the scientific community since it correctly presented the methodological procedures proposed, but regrettably not carried out. The title of the article is not suitable. The "narrative review" presented is methodologically insufficient for "Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Agricultural Extension Services in Adapting to Climate Change among Subsistence Farmers" Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Abstract does not present the methodological procedures that were presented in the methodology and which were regrettably not developed. The subsections and structure of the manuscript is not appropriate. The text does not present the results and discussion subsections. The manuscript is not scientifically correct. The references are sufficient and recent. <p><u>Additional suggestions/comments</u></p> <p>The methodology of this manuscript leads to two approaches: review systematic and meta-analysis. However, the manuscript does not present results according to the proposed methodology. I suggest reading:</p> <p>Pollock A, Berge, E. How to do a systematic review. International Journal of Stroke 2018, Vol. 13(2) 138–156.</p> <p>Patton MQ. Qualitative research & evaluation methods. Thousand oaks. Calif., London: Sage (2002). Link https://books.google.com.br/books?hl=en&lr=&id=ovAkBQAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=63.+Patton+MQ.+Qualitative+research+%26+evaluation+methods.+Thousand+oaks.+Calif.,+London:+Sage+(2002).&ots=ZSW_0pCDE2&sig=8eFa4r_SqdGtlgaeOIkeYChzlp0#v=onepage&q&f=false</p> <p>A Systematic Review attempts to collate all empirical evidence that fits pre-specified eligibility criteria in order to answer a specific research question. However, the manuscript reveals itself as a Narrative Review, non-systematic, usually faster and easier to make, but it is subjective and lead to a greater number of biases and errors. The Narrative Review does not describe the research processes relating to the studies researched, the selection of articles and their scientific quality. It tends to be partial, representing only one view of the authors on the topic. The Systematic Review requires explaining "Why the number of articles? " and to indicate their databases; show the excluded articles, show abstracts read and the excluded articles related to these abstracts, selected the full articles for reading and still show those excluded due to duplicity. It is necessary it not forgot the eligibility criteria and, finally, including the selected articles in the Systematic Review. In the present article, perhaps the analysis categories for data extraction and synthesis could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study details 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main conclusions: • Methodologies Used • Challenges Identified • Recommendations: <p>Meta-Analysis is widely used in clinical trials, but could be used in this manuscript. There are many methods used to estimate variance between studies, which should be mentioned. Researchers use the maximum likelihood estimator, which is considered to have less bias and is also one of the most commonly used. There are several advanced iterative techniques for calculating between-study variance, including maximum likelihood methods, restricted maximum likelihood, and random effects models. These methods can be performed with multiple software platforms, including Excel, Stata, SPSS, and R. It is very important to report the p value</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p><u>Commentaries para o Editor</u></p> <p>The manuscript presents serious errors regarding the study methodology. The authors proposed to carry out two procedures: systematic review and meta-analysis. However, they carried out a narrative review, usually faster and easier, and Meta-Analysis was not even carried out. These questions lead the reviewer to believe that the authors do not know or master such methodological procedures.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Haydée Serrão Lanzillotti
Department, University & Country	State University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil