

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_85241
Title of the Manuscript:	APPLICATION OF BENEFIT INCIDENCE ANALYSIS (BIA) AS A TOOL TO EVALUATE CLIMATE ACTION SPENDING ON CLIMATE SMART AGRICULTURE INITIATIVES: AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF THE USAGE OF BIA ON AGRICULTURE-RELATED SPENDING IN ZAMBI
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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Specific objectives of the study should be stated.Contribution of the study to the field OR justification should be stated.Geographical coordinates for the study are should be stated.Pre-testing of the instrument should be included.All variables used should be described/explained especially their measurement.THE RESULTS SHOULD BE INTEROGATED AND COMPARED WITH PREVIOUS/OTHER STUDIES.Objectives, results, conclusions and recommendations should be well aligned.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Agreed – two specific objectives clearly framed and included in the paperJustification provided by reframing the section formerly titled, “WHAT IS BIA AND WHY THIS TOOL” to “WHAT IS BIA AND WHY THIS STUDY?” It is the considered view of the authors that this section already provided some justification through explanation of the BIA tool and its usage. Therefore, hinging on the BIA narrative, the section has been beefed-up to also justify the entire study.Coordinates included and insertedQuestionnaire validity and reliability aspects included in manuscript accordinglyVariable measurements includedResults interrogated and compared to previous/other studies – see ‘discussion section’Objectives, results, conclusions and recommendations aligned and reframed
Minor REVISION comments	NONE	
Optional/General comments	The paper needs to be tightened up by effectively addressing all compulsory 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	