

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_131070
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the impact of extension advisory services on farmer’s climate change mitigation strategies in Misungwi District, Tanzania.
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	<b>Reviewer’s comment</b> Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	<b>Author’s Feedback</b> (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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript highlights not only importance of extension service in adapting to climate changes but also indicate the issues confronting extension workers in dissemination of the knowledge to the farmers. The results of this study would likely provide guidelines to the policy makers and planners in establishing a robust extension service for the communities. Capacity building of extension workers and provision of adequate financial resources is the key to effective knowledge transfer for adapting to climate changes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Alternate title is suggested hereunder: Extension advisory services on farmer’s climate change mitigation strategies in Misungwi District, Tanzania: Issues & Options	
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.	The conclusions and recommendations in the Abstract shall flow from the study results.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References seem sufficient. However, IPPC references are quite old. It is suggested to use the most recent IPPC reports as reference.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Quality of article is suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	Following are general comments to improve the manuscript: i) Figure numbers shall be given in the text instead of writing “bar chart” or “pie chart” for proper referencing. ii) Table-1 – The percentages given under first and last subheading in the Table is more than 100%. The reasons for that may be given. iii) Table-1 – It has been observed that 64 extension workers were surveyed but the results in the table, under different subheadings, is noted as 65. This needs to be corrected. iv) Table-2: Calculation is based on 62 respondents instead of 64. Needs clarification/correction. v) Table-3: Calculations are based on inconsistent number of respondents (64-65) which is to be corrected and shall be based on the number of extension workers surveyed. vi) Figure-3: Results are based on 63 respondents instead of 64. Need correction or reasons be given for the variation. vii) Conclusions: Shall be based on the study results and may be rewritten accordingly.	

PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer’s comment</b>	<b>Author’s comment</b> (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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Muhammad Tahir Anwar
Department, University & Country	Pakistan