**Authors’ Response to Reviewers’ Comments**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/N** | **Reviewers’ Comments** | **Authors’ Response** | **Reference** |
| 1 | Author(s) must briefly discuss the DOI model and use it to interpret the results or the author(s) must drop the claim that the study was informed by the DOI theory. | DOI model was included in the manuscript. A section on the applicability of DOI was added. DOI model was interpreted in the results and discussion sections.  | Refer to sections 4, 6.3 and 7.  |
| 2 | Fill the gap on how the use of IK can be complemented with the use of timely, relevant, andeasily accessible conventional weather forecast information. | A paragraph was added to address the research gap. | Refer to last paragraph of section 7. |
| 3 | There are no results explaining about the;-‘disappearing of local indicators at an alarming rate’ -‘documentation or preservation of IK in the results section. It only appears under discussions and recommendations.-Perception on IK reliability and usage | -Results on disappearing of local indicators have been highlighted in the results section.-Documentation and preservation of IK was omitted in the discussion section as it was not presented in the results section. It was only left in the recommendations section.- A section on results was added to reflect farmers’ perceptions of the reliability and age as a determinant in interpreting IK. | -See sections 6.2.1 and 6.2.2.-Refer sections 7 and 8.-See section 6.3. |
| 4 | Provide research questions for articulating the study focus. | Two research questions were articulated and added. | See section 2 of the manuscript. |
| 5 | Improving the methodology section. | The methodology section was describedfullyto reflect the FGD and interviews.  | See section 5 on methodology. Refer to the 1stsentence in the paragraph and 5thsentence in the second paragraph. |
| 6 | -Document proof reading for correcting language errors.-“Non-English and English plant and animal species were not used consistently in the text. | -The whole document was copy edited and proof read.-Non-English and English species names were improved to keep the consistency. Where English and scientific versions are not available this is indicated. | -Refer to the whole document.-Refer to the whole of section 6. |
| 7 | Inconsistent use of in-text citations (APA and Harvard styles). | The manuscript was corrected for uniformity. The Harvard style was maintained. Ampersands were used for in-text citations in brackets and in reference list. | Refer to the whole document. |
| 8 | Verify the references for completeness. | Three references used in the text which were not included in the reference were added. Reference list was checked again. | See the reference section. |