

Paper: “Efficacy of Adaptation of Smallholder Maize Production to Climate Variability in Selected Countries of Kenya”

Submitted: 30 November 2022

Accepted: 28 January 2023

Published: 31 January 2023

Corresponding Author: Millicent Kabara

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n1p189](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n1p189)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Edna Johnny
University of Nairobi, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Angelica Sterling
Universidad del Caribe, Mexico

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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: Angelica Selene Sterling Zozoaga	
University/Country: Universidad del Caribe, México	
Date Manuscript Received: December 26 th	Date Review Report Submitted: January 5 th
Manuscript Title: EFFICACY OF ADAPTATION OF SMALLHOLDER MAIZE PRODUCTION TO CLIMATE VARIABILITY IN SELECTED COUNTIES OF KENYA	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1227/22	
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.	5

<i>Yes, clearly express the content of the document, the development of the research, and the objective that was achieved</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>Yes, it presents all the necessary elements to give the reader a clear idea of the content</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>In some paragraphs, marked in yellow in the text, the wording can be improved to clarify the idea better.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<p><i>Although the method is well explained in a general way, it would be worth providing the context with the general characteristics of the population of farmers and which characteristics were taken into account to select the sample in addition to the size. Likewise, the method of application of the questionnaires and their characteristics (number and type of questions used for both, the levels of efficiency in the adaptation, and the other factors that were included in them) can be included.</i></p> <p><i>To improve the text, a list of the additional benefits the indicator refers to can be added. Likewise, it is necessary to explain how the list of the ten preferred adaptation options was selected and which ones were left out of the study.</i></p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The explanation of the results is clear and detailed considering the factors evaluated in the study.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Yes, the conclusions are entirely related to the content of the investigation. On the other hand, it is essential to mention in the study that, although it is a multi-criteria evaluation, the value that each farmer gave to each of the factors was subjective, so it would be interesting to conduct a study where the applications of this adaptation practices could have the possibility of being evaluated quantitatively.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<p><i>Yes, those cited in the text serve very well to clarify the concepts necessary for the development of the study.</i></p> <p><i>A revision is necessary since there are citations in the text that are outside the reference list and vice versa.</i></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):

It is good research work; it is only necessary to clarify the scope very well and mention future research that can be derived from it to strengthen the information and help the industry.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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:	
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 12/12/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/19/2022
Manuscript Title: EFFICACY OF ADAPTATION OF SMALLHOLDER MAIZE PRODUCTION TO CLIMATE VARIABILITY IN SELECTED COUNTIES OF KENYA	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	

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.	5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The topic is clear and adequate to the content of the article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The object of the study, methodology used for analysis and results were well presented in the abstract	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
There were very few grammatical errors	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>The methodology is understandable but there are however some concerns below</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selected sample is what percentage of the maize farming population of each county? • How many extension workers were selected to assign weights, and what were the ability of their practice to minimize climate change effects in production? • There are other metrological conditions and farm specific attributes that also affects influence efficacy of adaption that are not controlled by smallholders how could that influence your result? • Were there smallholders who never adapted any practice, if so how different were they in terms of efficacy than those who used one or more than one adaption method since they were randomly selected in the last stage of sampling? 	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The discussions emanated from the study, however the figures emanating from the weighted scores for the evaluation criteria is not explained.	
6. The conclusion or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The conclusion of the study is accurate and supported by the content and analysis. The indication in the study that the analysis may not be generalized for large-scale maize production is also well in place as the subjectivity involved in farmer self-rating may not explain the circumstances in large farmers with .	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>The references cited are comprehensive and appropriate</i>	

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):

Addressing the following comments will greatly improve the paper.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The paper contributes to knowledge on smallholder farming and adaption to climate variability.