

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSE_77187
Title of the Manuscript:	Resource based Conflict and Climate Change in the Niger Delta Region, Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>The paragraphs related to the relevant literature review are not clearly structured - it is recommended to use numbering and avoid successive titles, without phrases between them ("Conceptual review" and "Resource conflict").</p> <p>The author uses too much the main ideas (in quotation marks) from other studies and does not interpret them succinctly according to the research objectives.</p> <p>The Methodology paragraph is insufficiently developed. It is not clear enough how the triangulation method was used. The structure of the questionnaire is not presented. The research hypotheses are not clearly presented. The variables considered are not presented, and the demographic characteristics of the sample are not relevant in the context of the research (they could be included in a single descriptive table).</p> <p>The results presented in Table 4. Effects of climate change in Niger Delta should be further discussed: frequencies of maximum / minimum scores, consistency with other similar studies, etc.</p> <p>The correlation coefficient is incorrectly transcribed from the Table 5 in the text. The analysis related to the hypothesis testing is superficial and unclear.</p> <p>Discussions should focus more on research findings and community implications. In its current form, it represents a review of the relevant studies from the same geographical area. Concrete data on the negative effects on the area mentioned at the end of the paragraph (poverty, death rate, scarcity of water, etc.) would be useful.</p> <p>The English should be revised. Some expressions / typos are inappropriate. Some examples: p.1: PetroDollar; At present, the increase in temperature in the Niger Delta region. (<i>verb missing</i>); The study adopted Frustration/Aggression theoretical as its framework.; unravalled; p.2: Not long, agriculture that was the mainstay... p. 4: ... believe that their aspirations can note be achieved... p. 7: The questionnaire was a structured and self-administered. p. 9: The frequency above indicated 351 circumstances of missing case in all the matters in regards to alteration in weather conditions in the region. (<i>please rephrase</i>) p. 10: This indicates a bigger connection showing usual connections. (<i>please rephrase</i>) p.11: The result of the test of hypothesis revealed a higher relationship showing the normal connection. (<i>please rephrase</i>) In salt water areas where the water table is deep and expensive to tap, there is dependence on rainwater tables are deep and expensive to tap, there is dependence on rain and shallow well, which because of silt and clay soils tend to yield muddy water. (<i>please avoid the repetition</i>)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>An author mentioned in the text is not found in the bibliography (Miller et al., 1941) - p.6 A bibliographic source is not found as a reference in the text (Breuer & Elson, 2017). A bibliographic source incorrectly indicates the name of a co-author (the small name is indicated instead of the family name): Harris, J.M, Roach, B. & Codur, A.M. instead of Harris, J.M, Roach, B. & Anne-Marie, C. If there are multiple authors, the author should use <i>et al.</i> in text - eg. p. 4 – "Ikanone et al. (2014)" instead of "Ikanone, Egbo, Fyeface, Oduma and Ebimondikonyo (2014)"</p>	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	The topic is very interesting: the perception of communities on the negative effects of natural resource exploitation. The similarity index is 25%, with two papers used significantly as bibliographic sources (4-5%), which can be considered unproblematic. The abstract and introduction are correctly structured, focused on the regional context and the objectives of the study. Documentation is adequate. Applying the Frustration- aggression theory in this context is a very interesting approach.	
----------------------------------	--	--

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:	<i>Irina-Teodora Manolescu</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania</i>