



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/AJAEES/1856
Title of the Manuscript:	Using Indigenous Knowledge as a Strategy for Climate Change Adaptation among Farmers in sub-Saharan Africa: Implications for policy

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	This is an interesting topic and worthy of research. However, it reads more like an essay than an academic research paper. It speaks in general about Sub-Saharan Africa and does not provide enough individual examples which would capture the geographical and cultural nuances of this vast region.	This is a review paper.
Specific comments:		
Title and abstract	The title and abstract are fine. They accurately reflect the content of the paper.	ok
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	The objective of the paper is fairly well designed and while not entirely original is worthy of study.	
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	The references on climate change were adequate. However, there was not a lot of recent works cited on indigenous knowledge. For example John Briggs	There are some references on indigenous knowledge.
Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)	There was no methodology at all. This was clearly not a research paper.	I indicated earlier on in the methodology that the paper is a review paper which used current literature on the title of the paper.
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	The author/s describe the paper as an opinion paper. There was no data provided or analysed.	It is a review paper and doesn't require data analysis.
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	None that I could see.	There is none.
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)	This was not a research paper so there was no data on which to make a conclusion. The section on conclusion was brief and not very strong.	I have improved on it.
References	There should be more recent research on indigenous knowledge.	I also included more references.