Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_63349**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Perceived Climate Resilience and Adoption of Cocoa Agroforestry in the Forest-Savannah Transition Zone of Ghana**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

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/journal/10/editorial-policy)

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	**Climate resilence word must explained more definition is not clear** **Review of literature part is missing** **Research method is not clear** **If this is research study then must include tables and paragraphs more..** **Government data is missing when we do research study always need government data for comparison**	• Climate resilience has been defined and relevant literature has been cited (Page 2, Paragraph 3). • Relevant literature on agroforestry adoption was already reviewed (Page 2, Paragraph 1&4). • It is clearly stated in Page 3 Paragraph 3 that data was collected using structured questionnaire administered to 240 randomly selected household heads. • The table containing a descriptive statistics of variables included in the logistic regression model is too long, and such as, has been sent to Appendix 1 (Page 11). • Government data for the study area was not found. However, this does not undermine the results because the study focuses on the influence of farmers' perceptions on agroforestry adoption, rather than how farmers' climate perceptions compare with scientific data.
Minor REVISION comments	References pattern is wrong used in every paragraphs Explained it whether its rural or urban study based. Migration farmers study is not mentioned.	• The reference pattern could not be modified because the reviewer did not clearly indicate why the current pattern is wrong. • The study area is rural, and this has been added to the abstract and information on the study area. • Ethnicity was mentioned in the introduction (Page 2,Parapgrah1); and migrant farmers in Section 2.3, Page 4. However, migrant farmers were not discussed because the influence of ethnicity on adoption as indicated by the logistic regression, was not significant. Besides, the focus of the study is perceived climate resilience, rather than perceived land tenure security as it relates to ethnicity and migration.
Optional/General comments	Compared your study with others research work and must criticized their work	It is not a must to always criticise previous studies. Findings may also reinforce previous studies as has been demonstrated in the discussion.

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

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