

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_122001
Title of the Manuscript:	Building Resilience Through Community-Based Approaches: A Systematic Review of Climate Adaptation Strategies
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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it systematically reviews the role of community-based approaches (CBA) and knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) in climate adaptation, offering valuable insights into the effectiveness of participatory strategies in enhancing resilience to climate change. It bridges a critical gap by comparing these methods across different geographical contexts, providing a broad perspective that can inform future policy and practice. I appreciate the manuscript's focus on culturally relevant and community-driven solutions, which are essential for sustainable adaptation strategies. However, I believe the study could benefit from a more critical examination of the challenges and limitations associated with these approaches, which would provide a more balanced and comprehensive analysis.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article, "Building Resilience Through Community-Based Approaches: A Systematic Review of Climate Adaptation Strategies," is generally suitable as it accurately reflects the content and focus of the study. However, it could be made more specific to better capture the dual focus on Community-Based Approaches (CBA) and Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices (KAP) methods.</p> <p>An alternative title could be: "Enhancing Climate Resilience: A Systematic Review of Community-Based and Knowledge-Attitude-Practice Approaches to Adaptation Strategies"</p> <p>This title emphasizes both key methodologies and their role in climate adaptation.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive, covering the study's aims, methodology, results, and conclusions. However, there are some areas where it could be improved for clarity and completeness:</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusion of Geographic Scope: The abstract should briefly mention the global scope of the studies reviewed to give readers an idea of the geographical diversity covered in the systematic review. Highlight Limitations: Including a brief mention of any limitations or gaps identified in the research would provide a more balanced view. This could include challenges related to the scalability of the approaches or the variability of outcomes in different contexts. Specific Outcomes or Findings: The abstract could benefit from including one or two specific examples of the outcomes or findings from the review to give readers a concrete understanding of the results. Methodological Details: While the abstract mentions a systematic review of ten research articles, it would be helpful to briefly specify the criteria for article selection or the thematic focus areas to give readers a clearer idea of how the review was conducted. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>1. Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriateness: The abstract is clearly defined as a separate section and provides a concise summary of the manuscript. The structure of the abstract aligns well with standard academic conventions. Suggestion: The abstract could benefit from being divided into labeled subsections (e.g., Aims, Study Design, Methodology, Results, Conclusion) to improve readability and clarity. <p>2. Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriateness: The introduction is well-structured and includes the necessary components: context, literature review, research questions, objectives, and hypothesis. The flow from the context to the research question is logical. 	

Review Form 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion: No major changes are necessary here, but ensuring smooth transitions between paragraphs could enhance readability. <p>3. Methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriateness: The methodology is detailed and well-organized, with clear subsections that describe the systematic review process, including data gathering, sample selection, and analysis methods. The inclusion of PRISMA is appropriate and strengthens the structure. • Suggestion: Consider adding more subheadings to break down the methodology section further, such as "Data Collection," "Sample Selection," and "Data Analysis." This would make it easier for readers to follow the research process. <p>4. Results and Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriateness: The combination of results and discussion in one section is appropriate for a systematic review, as it allows for immediate interpretation of the findings. The section is divided into logical subsections, with tables and figures used effectively to present data. • Suggestion: The section could be split into "Results" and "Discussion" for clarity, particularly if there are distinct findings that could stand alone without immediate discussion. However, the current structure is also acceptable if the integration of results and discussion is central to the manuscript's argument. <p>5. Tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriateness: Tables are appropriately placed within the text to support the narrative and are referenced in the discussion. The information is relevant and clearly presented. • Suggestion: Ensure that all tables are numbered sequentially and that titles are descriptive enough to stand alone if needed. Also, ensure consistent formatting across all tables. <p>6. Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriateness: The conclusion is a distinct section that effectively summarizes the findings and implications of the study. It follows logically from the previous sections and reiterates the key points. • Suggestion: The conclusion could be more concise, focusing on the most critical takeaways without repeating content already covered in the discussion. It might also benefit from being clearly separated into a "Conclusions" and "Future Research" section. <p>7. References:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriateness: The references section is appropriately structured and provides a comprehensive list of sources cited in the manuscript. • Suggestion: Ensure consistency in formatting and correct any typographical errors. A uniform citation style should be applied throughout. <p>Overall Evaluation: The manuscript's structure and subsections are appropriate and well-organized. The flow of information is logical, and the division into sections aids in readability. Minor improvements in subsection headings, particularly within the methodology and results/discussion sections, could enhance clarity and accessibility for readers.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its systematic approach to reviewing and synthesizing existing literature on community-based approaches (CBA) and knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) in climate adaptation. The adherence to PRISMA guidelines ensures that the review process is transparent, methodical, and replicable. The selection criteria for the studies included in the review are clearly defined, contributing to the validity of the findings. Furthermore, the manuscript's analysis effectively integrates qualitative data from diverse geographical contexts, providing a comprehensive understanding of the effectiveness of CBA and KAP methods, which enhances the study's scientific credibility.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient and include a mix of foundational works and more recent studies relevant to the topics of community-based approaches (CBA) and knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) in climate adaptation. Most references are recent, with several from the past five years, which is appropriate for a study focused on</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>current adaptation strategies and methodologies. The inclusion of seminal works and key studies also supports the manuscript's credibility.</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Additional Recent Studies: While the manuscript includes recent studies, further inclusion of the latest research published in the last two years (2022-2024) could strengthen the review's relevance. This is particularly important in the rapidly evolving field of climate adaptation.2. Diverse Sources: It might be beneficial to include additional references from diverse regions and contexts to further substantiate the global applicability of the findings. <p>Suggested Additional References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Olazabal, M., De Gregorio Hurtado, S., & Salvia, M. (2021). "Urban Climate Adaptation in Europe: A Multidimensional Assessment." <i>Sustainability</i>, 13(17), 9954. DOI: 10.3390/su13179954.<ul style="list-style-type: none">o This study provides insights into urban climate adaptation strategies in Europe and could offer additional perspectives on CBA and KAP methods in urban settings.2. Measham, T. G., Preston, B. L., Smith, T. F., Brooke, C., Gorddard, R., Withycombe, G., & Morrison, C. (2011). "Adapting to Climate Change through Local Adaptation Planning." <i>Environmental Science & Policy</i>, 14(8), 930-941. DOI: 10.1016/j.envsci.2011.05.007.<ul style="list-style-type: none">o This paper discusses the importance of local adaptation planning, which aligns with the themes of the manuscript and could provide additional depth.3. Hurlbert, M., & Gupta, J. (2015). "The Split Ladder of Participation: A Diagnostic, Strategic, and Evaluation Tool to Assess When Participation Is Necessary." <i>Environmental Science & Policy</i>, 50, 100-113. DOI: 10.1016/j.envsci.2015.01.011.<ul style="list-style-type: none">o This reference could help explore the participatory dimensions of CBA and KAP more thoroughly.	
--	--	--

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications, but there are a few areas that could benefit from minor revisions to enhance clarity, readability, and professionalism.</p> <p>Minor Revision Suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grammar and Punctuation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ensure that all sentences are complete and that commas, periods, and other punctuation marks are used correctly. For example, in the abstract, "community's Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices (KAP)" could be revised to "community's knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP)" for consistency. ○ Correct small typographical errors, such as missing spaces after commas (e.g., "Macgregor,2007" should be "Macgregor, 2007"). 2. Sentence Structure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some sentences are lengthy and could be broken down into shorter, more concise sentences to improve readability. For example, in the methodology section, consider revising longer sentences to avoid potential confusion. ○ Simplify complex sentence structures where possible to ensure the text is accessible to a broader academic audience. 3. Word Choice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ensure consistent use of technical terminology. For instance, the manuscript sometimes shifts between "community-based approaches" and "CBA" without clear initial definitions or consistency. Define abbreviations the first time they are used and stick with one term thereafter. ○ Avoid overly complex or convoluted phrases when simpler alternatives would suffice. This helps maintain a clear and direct narrative. 4. Clarity and Flow: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some sections, particularly in the introduction and discussion, could benefit from smoother transitions between ideas. This will help maintain a logical flow and make the arguments easier to follow. ○ Clarify any ambiguous statements. For example, the statement "the study has several important implications for the delivery and success of climate adaptation interventions" could be made more specific by directly stating what those implications are. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Optional/General Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Visuals and Graphics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consider adding more visual elements, such as diagrams or infographics, to illustrate the key concepts and findings discussed in the manuscript. This could make the manuscript more engaging and help readers better understand complex information. 2. Abstract Structure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ While the abstract is comprehensive, you might consider structuring it with subheadings (e.g., "Aims," "Methodology," "Results," "Conclusions") to enhance readability and ensure that all critical elements are easily identifiable. 3. Methodology Expansion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If space allows, further elaboration on the thematic analysis process used in the methodology section could be beneficial. This would provide readers with a clearer understanding of how themes were identified and interpreted. 4. Impact on Policy and Practice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The manuscript could benefit from a more detailed discussion of how the findings might directly impact policy and practice. Providing specific recommendations for policymakers or practitioners could enhance the manuscript's practical relevance. 5. Engagement with Criticism: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To further strengthen the manuscript, consider engaging with potential criticisms or alternative perspectives on the effectiveness of CBA and KAP methods. Acknowledging and addressing these can demonstrate a balanced and thorough approach to the topic. 6. Future Research Directions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ While the manuscript does mention areas for future research, providing more specific 	

Review Form 3

	<p>suggestions for how future studies could address identified gaps or limitations would be valuable. This could include proposing potential methodologies or case studies that could be explored.</p> <p>These optional suggestions aim to refine the manuscript further and ensure it is as impactful and informative as possible for its intended audience.</p>	
--	--	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammad Rahmatullah
Department, University & Country	Northern University Bangladesh, Bangladesh