

Paper: “Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) Role in Driving Urban Climate Governance: The Case of CIKOD and GAYO in Ghana”

Submitted: 07 July 2022

Accepted: 17 August 2022

Published: 31 August 2022

Corresponding Author: Ama Kissiwah Boateng

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n26p95](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n26p95)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Busko, Tibor Laszlo
University of Public Service, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Odafivwotu Ohwo
Niger Delta University, Wilberforce Island, Bayelsa State, Nigeria

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Dr Odafivwotu Ohwo	
University/Country: Niger Delta University, Wilberforce Island, Bayelsa State, Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 08/07/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 09/07/2022
Manuscript Title: The third sector's role in driving urban climate governance: evidence from two major small and medium-sized cities in Ghana.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0728/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
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 is appropriate but could be better to use “Non Governmental Organization” for the sake of the diverse readership of the journal, who may not know what “third sector” means.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
Acronyms used should be defined (written) in full in the first instance. Examples (NGO, CIKOD & GAYO). In addition, the method of study should be better explained. It is quite not visible in the abstract.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
There are few observable sentence structure and grammatical errors in the paper. Proper proof reading is recommended.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<p>The method of study runs short of what is expected for this kind of study. Firstly, the source and year of the population figures for the two towns should be stated. Secondly, the maps should be enlarged and the letter fonts increased. Thirdly, the heads of the NGOs should have been interviewed not just any three members the author(s) felt may be knowledgeable about the activities of the NGOs, since the issues at stake were on the activities and mandates of the NGOs in climate change governance. Fourthly, an important aspect of the study (residents’ perception) of the activities of the NGOs was completely omitted. With this vital aspect of data collection omitted, the strength and validity of the study is called to question, because you cannot base your conclusion on what some staff of the NGOs said they do. The claimed activities of the NGOs have to be confirmed or otherwise by the residents who are the beneficiaries. The picture painted here is the case of the NGOs being Georges in their own case. This makes it difficult to objectively evaluate the contributions of the NGOs in climate governance in their respective areas of operations. This gap also made it difficult to assess the perception of the residents on climate change. This gap is serious and has to be addressed to add value to the study.</p> <p>In addition, the vegetation types, drainage, latitudes and longitudes, average monthly temperatures and rainfall of the study locations should be added in the description of the study areas, as they are important elements of climate change.</p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	1
Based on the observations in the method of study, the results may be considered inadequate.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	1
Based on the observations in the method of study and results, the conclusion has to be revisited after corrections have been effected in the methodology and results.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
There is need to increase the references to at least 20.	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Effecting the suggested corrections would improve the quality of the paper.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Insist on effecting the suggested corrections so that the quality of the paper can improve.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: BUSKO, Tibor Laszlo	
University/Country: University of Public Service, Hungary	
Date Manuscript Received: 4 Aug 2022	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs) role in driving urban climate governance: evidence from two major small and medium-sized cities in Ghana.	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

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.	4
<p>Though the title is sufficiently clear and adequate in its present form, I would suggest to consider the use of the of-genitive to avoid problems with the apostrophe. Also, I propose to name the NGOs in question to make the message more concrete. Suggestion: "The role of Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) in driving urban climate governance: the case of CIKOD and GAYO. I feel they are more important than the location of their activities. The choice and the geography are sufficiently explained in the introduction anyway.</p>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<p>I am happy with the Abstract. I would however suggest corrections like:</p> <p>(1) "Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs)" > Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs)</p> <p>(2) programs > programmes (the author uses BrE, where "program" spelt in the American way is used exclusively when the text is about computer codes)</p> <p>(3) "recognized" > recognised (as the author more often uses the "s" version than the "z" one, see e.g. "organisation", the requirement of consistence requires to keep to the chosen version unless there is a reason to diverge, e.g. in organisation names or quotes)</p> <p>(4) the full stop is missing at the end of the abstract</p> <p>(5) double space should be eliminated (see last line: "residents outside")</p> <p>(6) I still have a negative feeling about "NGOs" used instead of the classical spelling NGO-s, even if the former is more and more often used.</p>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>In addition to issues similar to the above mentioned ones, feel necessary to mention also the following ones:</p> <p>(1) inconsistent use of capital letters: “the 5th Assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)” > the 5th Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) or “study Areas” > study areas</p> <p>(2) Technically, the 2021 Census data did not state that now the aria would have a population of “about 200,672” a year later, but it will probably be only few who recognise the slip.</p> <p>(3) Space missing: “1,000mm” > 1,000 mm or “40minutes” > 40 minutes</p> <p>(4) Unnecessary page breaks: “The maps of the two study Areas are presented in figures 1 and 2.”</p> <p>(5) to-infinite instead of gerund: “He went on to say that,” > He went on saying (or: He added:) ...</p> <p>(6) double spacing should be avoided (“this dublicates” or “cities with”)</p> <p>(7) spelling errors (“dublicates” > duplicates)</p> <p>(8) the use of overly formal, even archaic words like “notwithstanding”</p> <p>(9) using spelling versions in an inconsequential manner</p> <p>(10) occasional errors due to oversight: “level as As Adu-Boateng” > ... level. As Adu-Boateng ...</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>Yes. Milk local experience and compare it to present literature to fill missing spots of information, to endorse or challenge accepted knowledge, and identify new gaps in our understanding.</p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
I see no logical or methodological problems there.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The objectives set for the article are met by the content and results.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p>I do not see a point in numbering References instead of listing them in alphabetical order, as the author uses a version of a simplified Harvard-style referencing (family name plus year) in the text. It is unusual, unnecessary and impractical when trying to find an author.</p>	

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):

As above.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: