

Review of: "Studying the Level of Livelihood Vulnerability and the Necessity of the Work Developing a Farmhouse Economic Economic Model to Adapt to Climate Change in the Coastal Area of Ben Tre"

Nguyen The Manh

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Comments for paper “**Studying the Level of Livelihood Vulnerability and the Necessity of Developing a Farmhouse Economic Model to Adapt to Climate Change in the Coastal Area of Ben Tre**”

Qeios ID: QZ3QZK · <https://doi.org/10.32388/QZ3QZK>

General comments: It is an interesting topic; however, the quality of the paper is not good enough. The paper does not look like a research paper. The paper needs more explanation to make it clearer.

Abstract

Basically, the abstract is a short summary of the research paper. It includes an overview of the topic, methodology, and results and discussion. Therefore, this paper should follow the basic principles for an abstract. It means that the author should elaborate more for a clearer abstract. Also, English needs editing.

Ask a problem.

I do not understand why the author put “ASK A PROBLEM.” I would suggest that this part is the INTRODUCTION of the paper. Based on that, this part should more elaborately present data and information to illustrate why the author needs to do this topic and how this paper contributes new knowledge to scientific society. The research questions need to be set up.

Research area and methods

In this part, authors need to explain why they selected Ben Tre province and what methods they used to select the study area. Therefore, authors need to explain more.

In terms of the map (Figure 1), the author needs to revise the map with an administration map of Vietnam and show where the study area is located with a high-quality map.

In the 2.2 section, the author indicated ECONOMIC MODELS; what kind of economic models did the author apply in this paper?

Questionnaire survey: What type of questionnaire did the author employ? How many FGDs did the author organize, and how did the author do that? The author needs to elaborate more to make the paper clearer.

What methods did the author use to select 80 households?

Research results and discussion

Section 3.1: In table 3.1, it is better to use SEASON CALENDAR than CROP CALENDAR. It is not logical from paragraph to paragraph; the author should revise it.

In paragraph *"From the summary results of Table 3.1, it shows that the seasonal calendar for each type of livelihood (crop growing, animal husbandry, fishing, and aquaculture) between communes has no difference. The big difference here is that people often have the flexibility to plant crops a few days earlier or later than the seasonal schedule depending on the soil conditions, ecological characteristics of each area, and the production experience of each household, family, and the impacts of annual weather and climate factors, specifically extreme weather events."* Page 5/12. I did not understand what the author meant here. Please explain more.

Section 3.2. Table 3.2, I CONFUSE author used the term LANDSLIDE here in the Bentre province, I would use the term RIVER EROSION. Please check it and select the more correct term.

Section 3.3, in Table 3.3, what do you mean by LEVEL OF DAMAGE in Table 3.3? I would suggest that in this section 3.3, the author needs to revise the paper to make it more logical and clearer.

In Table 3.4, I am not clear on the term unnatural factors. Please explain what the author means. LACK OF BREEDS AND PETS; PLANT COLOR (same in other tables)?

Main farming household livelihood models.

In the table in this section, based on what the author ranked and evaluated (T good; K good; TB average), and I do not understand how the author did it. What method did the author use to analyze? This section needs to be revised to be more logical and clearer.

Proposed solutions

The author did not analyse stakeholders in the methodology, but in the solution section, the author mentioned the role of Women's Union, Farmers' Union, Youth Union, and Veterans' Association in the solution for this paper. How does it link to the previous section?

Conclusions

The author should summarize the findings and suggest based on the findings. The author creates many suggestions that do not link to the findings of the research. Please reread, reanalyse, and revise it.

English needs to be edited, and I think this paper used Google Translate to translate from Vietnamese to English.

References

With 6 references, this part has poor research references. Authors should add more for discussion in the findings. Many articles and papers conducted in Vietnam and internationally on the same topic were published both in English and Vietnamese.