



Paper: “Social Mobilization to Reduce Vulnerability to Adverse Impacts of Climate Change in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria”

Corresponding Author: Stephena Ighedosa

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n21p167](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n21p167)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Published: 31.07.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision. *ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Reviewer Name:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received:06/04/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 14/04/2020
Manuscript Title: SOCIAL MOBILIZATION TO REDUCE VULNERABILITY TO ADVERSE IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE IN THE NIGER-DELTA REGION OF NIGERIA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0446/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: NO	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:NO	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
The title can be adjusted to make it clear that social mobilization is fronted as an approach/concept/method that can be adopted to reduce vulnerability to adverse impacts of climate change in the Niger-delta region in Nigeria	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>The abstract does not explicitly state the aim of the article, the methods followed and the contribution made.</p> <p>Rewrite the abstract to bring out explicitly what the article sought to address or explain; what was done; Why it was done? The findings? And demonstrate why the findings are useful</p>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>There are many cases as shown in the text of a one sentence paragraph.</p> <p>There are cases with no full stop and wrongly place commas making statements to be vague-see text</p> <p>There is unnecessary use of brackets as noted in the text</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>There is no link between the aim of the article and the method explained. This can be attributed to lack of clarity on exactly what is the aim of the article right at the back ground</p> <p>Social mobilization approach is explained under what the reader can assume to be the methodology (not explicitly stated) but it is not clear how the general approach can be specifically be adopted in the case of Niger Delta- This can also be attributed to lack of clarity on exactly what is the objective of the article</p>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>The body of the article is quite adequate in content but needs an overhaul in flow and formatting. Most of the parts have points numbered and thus need to be rewritten as paragraphs.</p> <p>There is need to demonstrate the manifestation of climate change in Niger Delta and the vulnerability of the Niger delta community due to climate change. As it is, the discussion on climate change is general.</p> <p>Statistics cited in form of percentages in the text under sub section 1.3.4 don't have an in text reference and it is not clear whether they are global or for Niger Delta? It is recommended that statistics are discussed and sources cited.</p> <p>On Section 4. There is disconnect between section 3 and moving into section 4. The purpose of section 4 is not explained and also hard to deduce. Is it part of SM stages? Why a section on its own?</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<p><i>(Please insert your comments)</i></p> <p>The recommendations are general and do not emanate from the study. See text.</p>	

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Up to date.	
Incorporate missing sources as indicated in the text	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

See text

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The paper can be improved if major corrections are carried out to address key deficiencies noted in the article.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 06/05/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 07/05/2020
Manuscript Title: SOCIAL MOBILIZATION TO REDUCE VULNERABILITY TO ADVERSE IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE IN THE NIGER-DELTA REGION OF NIGERIA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0446/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: NO	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: NO	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
Ok.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract explicitly states the aim of the article, the methods followed and the contribution made.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Previous comments and suggestions have been addressed.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Previous comments and suggestions have been addressed. There is a link between the aim of the article and the method explained.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Previous comments and suggestions have been addressed. The body of the article is quite adequate in content and there is enhanced flow and formatting. The paper has a demonstration of the manifestation of climate change in Niger Delta and the vulnerability of the Niger delta community due to climate change.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The recommendations flow from discussion and in line with objective but should be in paragraph form not numbered.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Up to date. Sources of figures should not have authors name and affiliation. Replace with the word, Author	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The paper is Ok. Recommended with one edit:

Replace:

The source caption under figures from Authors name

*Dr. Stephen Ighedosa, Department of Community Health, University of Benin
Teaching Hospital*

TO

Author.

This can be done by editor or the Author.

No further review is required after the slight correction.