

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

Nunziarita Palazzolo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Catania

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

The manuscript aims at propose a comparative case study focusing on the different approaches to facing climate change impacts and promoting sustainability in Sweden and India, namely two countries that are as remote from one another as appears possible.

Even if an interesting and current topic, the manuscript has several weaknesses. First and foremost, it does not follow the basis of a scientific article, mainly due to the following:

- The introduction is too weak, really few literature studies are cited to explain the state of the art (lack of literature about is particularly noticeable), and the novelty of the study is not highlighted. The section is just a sequence of a few generic sentences about the topic under investigation;
- A section about the data and the study areas is missing;
- A "Material and Method" section is missing. It is not clear which scientific methodology has been adopted and proposed in order to carry out the comparative study. Which parameters were used in the comparison? Which data? How the data has been handled? The method seems to be a bullet list of a few aspects in each country within the framework of climate change and sustainability (they do not cite sources or references supporting them), thus it seems that no scientific method was adopted;
- A results section is missing. Once again, just short generic sentences are reported, summarizing the differences between Sweeden and India repeated several times within the manuscript. A deep analysis of the results is missing. No figures with some graphs summarizing statistics, percentages (and so on) are reported and, in my opinion, they are crucial when a scientific comparative study is carried out;
- Conclusion section should be unique at the end of the manuscript. In this section a synthesis of the study should be reported together with the main results, future perspectives, main novelty introduced and so on.

Overall, the writing is poor, a robust argumentation of the research is missing as well as a scientific method. Furthermore, the few references cited within the bibliography are not used throughout the article.

Due to all these reasons, I feel that the study cannot be published in this form and that it should be totally revised, both from a writing point of view, that one of the formal constructions of the manuscript and, foremost, from a scientific and methodological point of view.

