

Review of: "The Role of Green Legacy in Promoting Sustainable Development and Combating Climate Change"

Daniela Salite¹

¹ Aston University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The report covers an interesting topic, which will make a good contribution to the extensive literature on climate change. However, it falls short on the analysis of the issue from different angles and the way the report is structured makes it even harder to follow.

My suggestion would be to rewrite the report by focusing in structuring it well, including providing background information beforehand in the introduction to allow the readers to understand the context and the importance of the study.

The report, including the abstract could also be better summarised to avoid the constant sense of repetition that we have throughout the report, and to improve the clarity, objectiveness, and links between sentences, while also shortening it. Some sentences are hard to follow and seem to be coming out from nowhere, and this problem starts right from the first sentence of the introduction. Also, I found the use of colons in most places as unnecessary as it doesn't add value to the report, but instead, makes nonsense.

The authors mentioned several gaps in research, but it was not clear if their intention was to address all the gaps.

The conceptual framework is dubious, and I am really not sure why it is needed in this report as a separate sub-section. Perhaps reconsider having only a small description of it as part of the methodology section. For the latter, I don't think putting the methodology in a table was a good idea. I felt that it made it messy and hard to read/follow. I suggest removing the table and just describe the methodology. Also, avoid repetition here.

Still in the methodology, most parts are not very clear. For example, in the research approach, there is no mention of types of data collected (e.g., primary, secondary) and how was the data collected (fieldwork in Ethiopia, literature review only, or both)?

- I did not understand what was the point of providing the definitions of target population, sampling technique and size if the authors are not providing any figures of it. The latter would be of more value to the report.
- In the data collection tools, the authors failed to explain what was the aim of the tools.

Some of the information missing in the methodology seems to be placed on the results and discussion section. Still in this section, although the authors have provided their results, they failed to clearly explain and discuss the results. This resulted in a conclusion that was weak and with some new content. So, I advise the authors to improve these sections along with the rest of the report.

