

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"

Bastiaan Louman¹

¹ Tropenbos International

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article is relevant and has quite a lot of information on the livelihoods and (perceived) vulnerability of the communities. Its readability could be improved by asking an English science editor to have a look at the text. In particular, some words seem to be wrongly translated from Vietnamese. Also, sentences are sometimes very long, making it difficult to grasp what the author intends to say. Furthermore, it is good practice not to repeat in the text what can also be seen in the tables/figures. Better add in the text more details of what you see in the tables, particularly when some data are outliers or unexpected. Its scientific value could be considerably improved by adding a literature search that helps you to construct a conceptual framework and explains some of the methodological choices you have made. For example, in your table 3.3, you chose to show the level of damage. But this is not necessarily a good indicator for vulnerability. What is the conceptual framework you used to make that connection? The same table also only shows the damage caused by salt and by the combination of salt and flood. Why? In the text before that, you are indicating that also droughts influence livelihoods. And what about rising temperatures or rapid, large fluctuations in temperature? You probably have all of that in mind, but for the reader, it is not clear, so it would be good to explicitly explain in the text why you make certain choices, preferably based on previous, published (and therefore referenced in your text) research. The description of the methods would also need to be extended in such a way that the reader could use your description to do similar research in other areas.

I am missing a more in-depth discussion that relates your results to existing literature on the topic.

In relation to the conclusions, it is difficult to tell whether these reflect your results, because several of your conclusions relate to specific communities/districts, but most of the presented data do not show that distinction. Also, the analysis of alternative economic models is a bit superficial, and I would be reluctant to draw conclusions from that analysis. So, my suggestion would be to either enhance the analysis or omit conclusions regarding alternative models. You may make some recommendations in that regard, but then you probably should use literature to justify those recommendations.