

Review of: "Financial Repercussions of Carbon Emissions and Depletion of Natural Resources: The Role of Fiscal Policy in Determining Health Expenditures"

Maham Furqan

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper addresses some critical points and the topic is also well thought-out. However, it is arguably an overly examined topic in a global context at least, which is why the author needs to make sure that the arguments are not repetitive and discussions are structured in a sound, convincing, and unique way. Having said that, here are a few suggestions on improving the write-up.

1. As some of my colleagues have mentioned, there is a need to improve the flow of the abstract as right now, it seems to lack clarity. The abstract should be structured from generic to specific information so sentences like "Empirical evidence shows that carbon emissions are a major contributor to the increase in public and private health expenditures" can be the opening sentence and other specifics like the aim, data, and methodology of the study can be discussed later. The abstract also has weird inconsistent structure. For instance, the data and methodology are mentioned in the last sentence of the abstract which negatively affects its readability. Please consider updating the abstract for better clarity and flow. University of Wisconsin-Madison has a good resource on it <https://writing.wisc.edu/handbook/assignments/writing-an-abstract-for-your-research-paper/>.
2. There are big chunks of the paper that don't have any citations which negatively affects the credibility of the paper. I highly recommend the author to add more citations. If they are to separate their personal arguments from current literature, it might be helpful to have a separate section for theoretical framework where some of this personal argumentation could be added without the need for extensive referencing to literature. Nevertheless, the paper seems under-cited throughout which needs to be fixed. For instance, the first few paragraphs of section "1. Nexus of Environmental Conditions, Health Expenditures, and Green Financing" barely have any citation.
3. When I look at tables 1-4, this is too much information sourced from a third-party which does not serve well for the authenticity and logic of this paper. It would be helpful for the author to weave things into a story instead of pasting data-dense tables from other sources into the text. Just taking critical information and combining all of that into a concise table is more appealing and convincing. Putting things into a graphic might be another good way to make the information concise and easily digestible.
4. There is no literature review in the paper which is a huge hit on the credibility of the paper. It's clear that the author has reviewed some literature so putting it in its own explicit section might help. It can also help set the stage for the rest of the paper and highlight a clear and convincing literature gap. Right now, because there is no clear lit review section, I don't see how the study adds value to the literature pool. There is also no synthesis of current literature which should

be included.

5. It will be helpful to break down the methodology section into some sub-sections e.g., data, methodology, etc.

Currently, its really hard to read through and it is also unclear how and why the current methodology was chosen.

6. While I see the findings section, there doesn't seem to be any clear discussion section. The findings section is only explaining the empirical results without clear and logical theoretical background and explanation. It would be helpful to have a clear discussion section as it can also help the researcher link their results with other authors' work to tie any loose ends. That will be another opportunity for the author to show how their work fills the literature gap and adds value.
7. Lastly, there is no conclusion section and the paper jumps straight into policy implications. The author needs to create a clear conclusion section and that can be broken down by a number of sub-sections including policy implications/recommendations, study limitations, and future directions. Right now, this policy implication is not doing justice to the study focus and needs to be flushed out more for clarity and clear and solid argumentation.