

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Environment and Climate Change |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJECC_121532 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | FARMERS VULNERABILITY TO CLIMATE CHANGE AND THEIR SUGGESTIONS TO OVER COME |
| Type of the Article | |

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|--|---|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | The manuscript is important in the scientific community because it brings out the vulnerability of the communities. Most adaptation activities are not guided by analysis of vulnerability and this manuscript has brought out this important aspect. I like the manuscript | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Title is suitable | |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | Abstract is comprehensive . the section on methodology needs to be improved | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | The subsections are appropriate | |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | Scientific correctness is shown by using scientific proven methodology Robustness is not coming out clearly because the detailed methodology is not articulated in the methodology section The manuscript is Technically sound since it touches the vulnerability of farmers | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | These are okay | |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | English needs improvement particularly on sentence construction | |
| Optional/General comments | Generally the manuscript is okay but the section on methodology needs to be improved tremendously | |

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: | Komutungwa Everline |
| Department, University & Country | Uganda |