

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_87597
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on the Socio-Economic and Personal characters of the Adopter and Non- Adopter Respondents of climate Resilient Technologies.
Type of the 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 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title should be recast i.e Analysis of socio-economic and personal characteristics of the adopters and non-adopters of climate change resilient technologies in West Bengal, India 2. Abstract: The abstract is too long. It should be a summary of major findings rather than the subject of introduction that was dwelled so much by the author. 3. Objective: the main objective should be recast. i.e was to investigate the socio-economic and personal characteristics of the adopters and non-adopters of climate change resilient technologies 4. Materials and methods: What is the justification of the researcher's selection of 30 respondents uniformly from each village? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is the sample size of farmers in each village that warranted equal selection of respondents - The sample selection procedure was not scientific 5. Results and Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of abbreviation : abbreviation full meaning (OBC,SC) at first mentioned and then put in bracket so that subsequent used in the text will be understandable to the readers - Figures should be inserted into the main text close to their first citation. The idea of lumping figures i.e Fig 1.1 to 1.4 after the discussion is not reader friendly. - Tables should come after the discussion of the result. Here, author first inserted tables before discussion. - Author should focus more on the significant difference of means in the comparison group rather than high mean values - Table 2 should be titled like table 1 - Table 2 showed the result of correlation between socioeconomic /personal characteristics with the adopters. However, this study was structured on a comparative analysis btw adopters and non-adopters, hence, it would be a great advantage and robust research if the author can also run the correlation analysis of relationship btw socioeconomic/personal characteristics and non-adopters. This will enhance the readers understanding of factors influencing adoption and non-adoption of climate change resilient technologies 6. Conclusion: The conclusion is scanty. It should be expanded to incorporate major significant findings of this study. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	It was observed that the researcher worked in isolation. This is because findings from this study stood aloof without comparing with known literatures findings. This would enable the author highlight the strength and weakness of his research findings with known literatures. It should be noted that research is a global community, therefore, it is imperatives for researchers to always compare the output of their research study with the results of other authors that had worked in similar field of study to enhanced robust research literatures	

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Coster Adeleke Sabitu
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Agriculture, Nigeria