

Review Form2

Book Name:	Current Research Progress in Agricultural Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2336
Title of the Manuscript:	Awareness, Adaptation, and Constraints in Climate-Smart Agriculture: A Study on Farmer Perceptions and Practices
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript will be important for scientific communityas the topic is relevant for climate smart agriculture which is a better way. However, the manuscript is not yet robust both in content and analytical procedure. I like the manuscript because it addresses the on going global challenge of climate change and its adaptation strategies	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, the title is not suitable. Awareness and utilisation of Climate Smart Agriculture Among Crop Farmers. Perception could have been better but there is nothing indicating perception in the study. It could have made the work to be more robust	
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,it is good enough though more can be done	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes butthere is no problem statement in the study and it is against the backdrop of problem statement that the objective of the study should emanate. The result discussion is not robust as tables were just explained but no implicationswere inferred from the results	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically correct and technically sound because the methodology used is robust as well as the analysis. Even though there is need for more improvements. Including an hypothesis will make themanuscrip to be better off and regression analysis can then be used	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :-	Yes	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, though some aspects can be stated in a better way e.g less percentage.....	
Optional/General comments	The socio- economic characteristis of the respondents were not part of the objectives whereas there is result for it in result discussson. Hence, the first objective should be to ascertain the socio-economic characteriatics of the respondents. Hypothesis such as there no significant relationship between the socio economic characteristics of repondents and their utilisation of climate Smart Agriculture. The sampling procedure and sample size not adequately captured. There are some major aspects such as problem statement, some important objectives that are missing in the manuscript which are to be included for the work to be robust	

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:	Adepoju Oladoyin Aderonke
Department, University & Country	Federal College of Agriculture, Nigeria