

# Review of: "Sustainable Agriculture and Climate Resilience in Türkiye: A Comprehensive Analysis"

Concetta Cardillo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Council for Agricultural Research and Agricultural Economy Analysis

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The article deals with an interesting topic, that of climate change and how agriculture must deal with the problems related to this topic, in particular the situation in Turkey is examined. However, I believe that the article needs a strong revision operation because at the moment I don't think it is ready to be published. The author addresses a variety of aspects but does so in an unclear manner, it is fine to mention what the objectives are, but it must be done in a more fluid manner, making a homogeneous discussion and not inserting an infinite series of bullet points.

The abstract is too long and unclear, furthermore there is no reference to the methodology used. The introduction initially seems well done but later becomes less clear, the concepts seem disconnected from each other, and it would be more appropriate to include other bibliographical references. After having framed the topic and the area of study, the objective should be better explained, what this article adds to the existing literature and how the article will be structured.

I think that the entire structure of the article should be revised following a standard form: introduction, analysis of literatures and sources, applied methodology, results, possible discussions, conclusions. Partly in the article the contents are already there but they need to be explained better, for example, it is fine to present what the Turkish government has done on agriculture and climate changes, but it must be a shorter paragraph, with the definition of the objectives and how the government has addressed them or could address them, trying to relate the various aspects and not simply listing them. Then there is the part where the author talks about individual products, that should be the most empirical part of the study and then, also the political implications are indicated but they should be included in the conclusions.

Below are a series of more specific suggestions:

- Pay attention to how the chemical formulas are indicated, for example  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  or  $\text{CO}_2$  sometimes they are written well other times not.
- Pay attention to the use of uppercase and lowercase letters, a capital letter is often used after ":" but it is not necessary.
- Pay attention to the numbering of the figures, why is the first figure 5.1 and not 1? And so on, the others too, then at a certain point there is a figure 14 which does not follow the numbering. Furthermore, the source must always be indicated in the figures.
- Pay attention to the many repetitions in the text.

