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

Daniel Balsalobre Lorente[1]

1 Universidad de Castilla La Mancha

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. Introduction is not a place to discuss the academic literature. There is a dedicated section named "Literature Review" to discuss this. The authors need to completely shift the discussion on academic literature from Introduction to the Literature Review. The Introduction should talk about the policy-level problem the study is addressing. Please refrain from discussing the method/variables/context. These are mere vehicles to arrive at the contribution, but they are not contributions in themselves. Think about the policy void in the chosen context the study is addressing. That will lead toward the contribution of the study.

2. The research gap is superficial. It should emerge from the debate of the academic literature. The authors have listed the studies, but the debate is completely missing. Try to focus on creating the debate along the line of the potential policy contribution of the study. That will help in formulating the research gap.

3. The mathematical model misses the much-needed theoretical/logical underpinning. The missing logic behind the inclusion of the explanatory variables leaves enough room for the estimation bias (multicollinearity, omitted variable, reverse causality) at the theoretical level.

4. Authors have tried to demonstrate their prowess over the method without digging deeper into the results. If the findings do not challenge the persisting policies in the countries, then how the study is contributing to the literature? If the findings corroborate the persisting policies, then the study is redundant.

5. The practical implications do not make any sense. These implications could have been drawn without even doing any kind of analysis. The main reason behind such a lacuna in the implications is the results conforming to the persisting policies. If the policies are good, the results will follow, So, practically there is no room for implications, thereby nullifying the very rationale of the study.
I recommend some references that can enrich paper

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2019.101485

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gr.2023.02.023

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2022.103091

6. Results should not be discussed again in the Conclusion. Avoid doing it completely.

7. Authors need to thoroughly improve the language of the study.