

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_130449
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF SELECTED CLIMATE VARIABLES AFFECTING COCOA OUTPUT IN CROSS RIVER STATE, NIGERIA (1993-2023)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The findings of the study provide critical insights into how climate variables, such as temperature, rainfall, and humidity, influence cocoa production, a key agricultural sector in Nigeria. By addressing both short- and long-term impacts of these variables using an ARDL model, the study fills a significant gap in localized data and presents actionable recommendations for stakeholders to mitigate climate change effects. These insights are not only vital for improving cocoa yields and the livelihoods of farmers but also for policies makings on climate resilience and agricultural sustainability in the region.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Analysis of Selected Climate Variables Affecting Cocoa Output in Cross River State, Nigeria (1993-2023)" is informative but could be more concise and impactful. Therefore, I will suggest this title: "The Impact of Climate Change on Cocoa Production in Cross River State, Nigeria: An ARDL Approach (1993-2023)"	

Review Form 3

<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, summarizing the objectives, methodology, key findings, and recommendations. Some improvements can be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Clarify the Objective. ➤ Include Data Sources: Mention the primary data sources. ➤ Focus on Key Results: Streamline the findings by emphasizing the most impactful variables and their implications. ➤ Emphasizes the practical implications: Mentions the importance of the findings. 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound, as it employs an appropriate methodological framework, provides detailed data analysis, and draws logical conclusion However, there are areas that require further attention to ensure scientific rigors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data Description: While data sources are mentioned, there is limited explanation of how the data were pre-processed or validated. For example, were any adjustments made for missing or outlier values in the dataset? Are there any known biases or limitations in the data collected by NiMet? Suggestion: Add a brief section on data quality checks and preprocessing steps to enhance transparency. 2. Interpretation of Results: Some interpretations in the results section are broad or overly technical, making it harder for readers to grasp the significance. Suggestion: The discussion should delve deeper into the underlying mechanisms through which climate variables influence cocoa output 3. Policy Recommendations: While recommendations are made, they are somewhat general. Suggestion: How can farmers in Cross River State adapt to the changing climate? What role can government agencies and other stakeholders play in supporting climate-resilient cocoa production? 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are generally relevant to the study's focus, providing a foundation for the research.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English quality is suitable for scholarly communication, but minor improvements in grammar, clarity, and conciseness will significantly enhance the manuscript's readability and professional presentation.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The research is well-structured, with clear objectives, robust methodology (ARDL model), and insightful findings that contribute to understanding how climate variables impact cocoa production in a key region of Nigeria.</p> <p>While the manuscript is generally sound, there are a few areas where it could be improved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Strengthening the theoretical framework with more context on how climate variables physiologically affect cocoa plants. ➤ Enhancing the data section by detailing preprocessing and validation methods. ➤ Including more specific and actionable policy recommendations to support sustainable cocoa farming. ➤ Improving language clarity and the presentation of figures and tables can further enhance the overall quality of the manuscript. ➤ Expand the reference list to include more recent and relevant literature. 	

Review Form 3

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:	Adesiyan Taiwo Fausiyat
Department, University & Country	Middle Tennessees State University, United States of America