

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_122001
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Building Resilience Through Community-Based Approaches: A Systematic Review of Climate Adaptation Strategies</b>
Type of the Article	Peer Reviewed

#### **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**

<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 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.	This manuscript is important to the scientific community based on its in-depth analysis into existing knowledge with the purpose of scrutinizing and giving insight or throwing more light into the methods ability to sustainable living of individuals. This Manuscript will also aid in filling a notable research gap in the field of climate resilience. Moreover the findings of this manuscript will inform policy makers on the necessary importance of including the knowledge of individual in the enhancing of climate change adaptation and resilience among local communities of climate change	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the proposed title gives in-depth knowledge on the content of the Manuscript	
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.	Yes, the abstract is well written in sections and provides easy fore-knowledge on the content of the Manuscript	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The Heading for 3 (Results and Discussion ) and Heading 4 (Discussion) . If the Author(s) decided to maintain it as 'Results and Discussion' then the Heading 3 and 4 should be merged as one or if separated, then it should be Results as Heading 3 and Discussion as Heading 4.	
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.	This manuscript gives detailed understanding of the approaches which climate adaptation strategies can built. Also when it comes to the choice of selection of and approach based on location and other factors, the manuscript will provide a best source and improve or build on scientific ideas	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	In the Line 8 of the manuscript from the introduction, the citation (W,2005), author(s) should reconsider and put in the right citation and or format. In the introduction section, the citation (Al, n.d ), Author(s) should properly cite or look for proper citation	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes it is but the Author(s) should look through for grammatical error and correct them to enrich the quality of the Manuscript	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From the flowchart of the methodology, the shape of all the steps seems to be the same. Does the Author(s) mean all the steps written are processes?</li> <li>• “However, it was far to important that the process of review should be fair and bias free and done in a way that is comprehensible” Author(s) should rephrase the sentence coated above</li> </ul>	

### 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>Amaning Raphael Kwakye</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Energy and Natural Resources, Ghana</b>