

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_88535
Title of the Manuscript:	Public Perception of Climate Change awareness in Akinyele Local Government Area, Oyo State, Nigeria
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.journalgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/editorial-policy>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The introduction seems an introduction in the place, but lacks coherence and justification of ideas and/or facts pertaining to the background of the study. The manuscript's introduction is more of a result and discussion section than an introduction in its real sense. The author discussed the results of previous findings in the introduction instead of defending or refuting the main ideas of the different school of thoughts. This makes the introduction to lack some scientific soundness.</p> <p>Also, the geographical layout of the study (location of the study area) must not be part of the study's background. The spatial delimitation of the study should be written under the M&M section. The background of the study or introduction should end with a clear problem statement and not the spatial delimitation as the case in this manuscript.</p> <p>At the level of the M&M section, even though the study is purely descriptive, the author should have explain in few lines how data collected was analysed in the study. The sampling procedure and data collection methods have been clearly written but the data analysis part is missing.</p> <p>The results and discussion section is well presented though. The data and/or information used in this study is gotten from household heads and other populations with little or no education. It deals with people's perceptions and lacks scientifically proven facts. Therefore, the results of this study must be interpreted and used with a lot of caution.</p> <p>Minor revisions required especially at the introduction.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Efuetlancha Ernest Nkemele
Department, University & Country	University of Dschang, Cameroon