

Review of: "Climate Change and Sustainability: A Comparative Case Study"

Éva Hideg¹

¹ Corvinus University of Budapest

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Éva Hideg:

Peer review on Climate Change and Sustainability: A Comparative Case Study written by Dr Ashwini Sonawane, Sureka KR

The draft article has chosen a very good topic, because the practice of implementing the meaning of sustainability is very important issue in terms of influencing the course of climate change and the research that underpins it. In the draft article, the author intends to present the practices in Sweden and India and draw conclusions from their comparison for formulating policies to promote sustainability. The comparative analysis of these two conceptions and policy of sustainability, which are, one might say, on opposite sides of the spectrum, provides an interesting and uncommon insight into the sustainability perceptions and practices of countries around the world that are in the interval of these two endpoints of the scale. From this point of view, the author's research and article was a good and useful choice. It can also provide useful input as to which understanding of sustainability is more conducive to the implementation/feasibility of sustainability policies in practice.

This aim and research topic is to be widely supported, as the visions and policies of a sustainable future and the paths to it can be very different, but these differences can be analysed in terms of their effectiveness and can also provide lessons for further shaping the sustainability paths of both the countries analysed and other countries.

It could also be interesting to examine whether or not the Swedish and Indian concepts of sustainability in practice have the same content. The reviewer thinks that the Swedish and Indian understanding of sustainability is very different. While the Swedes use the classical content, which was first formulated in the Brundtland Report, the Indians interpret sustainability in terms of their local, practical needs, which is thus much more complex because of its multiple dimensions, and also because the proportions of the individual components are left unclear and only their harmonious relationship is emphasised. But it remains unclear what this harmonious relationship might mean. The point of difference between of the meaning of sustainability does not seem to have been perceived by the author and is not discussed in the following case studies. This should also be analysed in detail, both in terms of the reasons for the different perceptions and the consequences that follow from them, which are also manifested in relation to the individual themes of sustainability thinking and planning.

The author first presents the two case studies of the practice of sustainability shaping in Sweden and India. However, this

part of the article is very sketchy, as it does not show what goals, policies, measures and practical results and failures have been and are happening for realization of them in each country. Nor does it show how Sweden and India's natural and social conditions and exposure to climate change are similar and different. Nor is it clear how purposefully these countries are shaping their sustainability futures as a result of these different situations. The reviewer recommends a much more detailed and comprehensive presentation of the details of both case studies.

A methodological shortcoming of the draft article is that it does not address the methodology of the comparative analysis to be carried out or has been carried out. The reviewer recommends that the criteria on the basis of which the author intends to carry out or has carried out the comparison of the sustainability policies and intended actions and implemented practices in the two case studies should be explicitly stated. Without these, the author highlights similarities and differences between sustainability policies of two countries only in an imaginative way, rather than on the basis of comparisons based on systematic studies. This is why the depth and elaboration of the conclusions, which present and summarise the new findings, is very weak.

The criteria for comparison may include, for example:

- What kinds of similarities and differences are in the climate and natural environment problems of the two countries?
- To what extent are they adequate policy priorities for sustainability pathways to the environmental and climate problems in each country?
- The extent to which wealth and poverty are part of the sustainability problem and of the policy measures to achieve sustainability?
- The extent to which population characteristics are part of the climate and sustainability problem?
- The extent to which the socio-economic and natural environment dependent advantages and disadvantages of a policy towards sustainability based on participation and cooperation developed through education or a centrally determined sustainability policy imposed by socio-economic actors are felt in the two countries?
- To what extent originate potential advantages and disadvantages of technological development and international cooperation/environment in each of the countries under study?
- How well the sustainability policies of each country are grounded by forecasting and/or foresight and foresight activities during the decision preparation?
- How similar and different the two countries' approaches to the future and to foresight are?
- What results each country is achieving and how quickly they are being achieved?
- What are the failures of sustainability policies and practices in each country?
- How political and practical corrections are made to sustainability policies and plans in both countries?

- How are the interests of present and future generations and the rights and opportunities to use natural-infrastructural-economic-social-human and so on environmental resources harmonised in the sustainability policy visions of the two countries, which have different understandings of sustainability?

Of course, it is not possible to analyse all aspects in one article, but it is useful to select a few of them and use them to set the context for the research and then the article. The author's interest and expertise are decisive in the choice, as he or she will have to carry out the research needed.

The referee recommends that the comparative analysis according to the criteria considered and chosen should be supported by recent literature from other authors, research results, statistical data and the results of author's own content and data analysis. In addition, the referee recommends that the results of the comparison, including similarities and differences according to each aspect of the comparison, are presented in tabular form for better clarity and ease of understanding.