



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_47872
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysing smallholder farmers' perceptions of climate change, preference and willingness-to-pay for seasonal climate forecasts in Savelugu Municipality of Ghana
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>An interesting paper and a very timely subject in this era of increased ambiguity in climate change adaptation debate! I enjoyed reading the concepts and the recommendations the authors put forward. However, I have the following comments and suggestions:</p> <p>-Page 3 lines 102 – 105, sections were not numbered in this paper! Review.</p> <p>-Page 6 lines 225 – 227, farmers perceived existence of climate change, so what does that imply?</p> <p>-Page 10 line 328 shows a statement of bias. Review it.</p> <p>-The discussion needs some expansion as explanations of the results are skeletal. The link with the reviewed literature should be properly highlighted and explained.</p> <p>Act on the corrections in these colours in manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Uncertain-clarify. 2. Accept if you agree 3. Delete if you agree. <p>-You may wish to indicate in your methods section, any ethical approval sought.</p>	<p>Paragraph removed.</p> <p>The farmers' perception on climate change was based on a five-point likert scale that ranged from 1 (strongly disagreed) to 5 (strongly agreed). The estimated mean value of 4.45, indicated that the farmers agreed that there are changes in the climatic conditions such as temperature and rainfall.</p> <p>Thus, although radio owners had a higher probability of showing positive WTP for seasonal weather forecasts, they were also not willing to pay higher amount for the same service. The finding from Zongo <i>et al.</i> (2016) also showed that farmers expected a free climate information if the information was broadcasted on radio channels.</p> <p>Fonta <i>et al.</i>, (2018) also found that WTP for weather index-based insurance was high for male heads than female heads. Mabe <i>et al.</i>, (2014) also found that males were willing to pay more for climate information than females. Jellason <i>et al.</i>, (2019) explained that farmers were more likely to integrated adaptation into farming if there perceived climate change as occurring. Contrary, Abugri <i>et al.</i>, (2018) found that the WTP for drought insurance by farmers decreased as the farmers perceived changes in climate. NOTE: other discussions were highlighted in the text.</p> <p>Addressed accordingly.</p> <p>A consent statement was provided to the respondents and a farmer was considered as a respondent after declaration and signing the consent statement. This consent statement include maintaining the privacy of the respondents.</p> <p>Addressed</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>References:</p> <p>-Please check my observations and be consistent.</p> <p>-GSS 2014- only one is cited in text. Review.</p> <p>-Page 4 line 151 this reference (Anaman and Jair, 2001) is missing on the list.</p> <p>-Page 11 line 333 Add a reference there e.g. (Jellason et al. 2019): Jellason, N.P.; Baines, R.N.; Conway, J.S.; Ogbaga, C.C. Climate Change Perceptions and Attitudes to Smallholder Adaptation in Northwestern Nigerian Drylands. <i>Soc. Sci.</i> 2019, 8, 31. (Read this paper to get more justification for perception leading to adaptation for your discussion section)</p> <p>-Page 14 line 428 (Ingram, K. T., Roncoli, M. C., & Kirshen, P. H. (2002). Opportunities and constraints for farmers of West Africa to use seasonal precipitation forecasts with Burkina Faso as a case study. <i>Agricultural Systems</i>, 74(3), 331-349) This reference was not cited intext-review it.</p> <p>-Page 15 line 467 (Roncoli, C. (2006). Ethnographic and participatory approaches to research on farmers' responses to climate predictions. <i>Climate Research</i>, 33, 81-99) This reference was not cited intext-review it.</p> <p>-Page 15 line 474 (Shankar, K.R., Nagasree, K., Venkateswarlu, B., Maraty, P., (2011). Constraints and suggestions in adopting seasonal climate forecasts by farmers in South India. <i>Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension</i>, 17 (2), 153–163) This reference was not cited intext-review it.</p> <p>-Page 16 line 487 (Can you place these references in sequence?) Zongo et al. (2015) should come before Zongo et al. (2016).</p> <p>All the best.</p>	<p>Removed from list</p> <p>Removed from list</p> <p>Dropped from list</p> <p>Rearranged</p>
Optional/General comments		

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Author did not explain whether he received ethical approval to undertake this study.</p>	No ethical clearance was needed and required for this study. However, a consent statement was signed by the respondents. This was included in the revised manuscript.

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>