

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_112909
Title of the Manuscript:	Fields of Balance: An Extensive Analysis of Conventional and Organic Agriculture in the Contemporary Era
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No, it isn't. It only quotes already existing study, without bringing any new insight and the argumentation is often ideological and confuse. Important perspective such as dietary shifts are only mentioned in the conclusions. The main focus is on food production levels, but the need to really increase that much the food production is not well demonstrated. Finally, the absolute impacts of both conventional and organic agriculture must be analysed, not only the impacts in relation to the amount of food production. In order to achieve climate and environmental goals and guarantee climate neutrality by 2050 absolute emissions are crucial. Yes Yes No, the argumentation is confused and misleading. For instance, the comparison between organic and conventional agriculture is based on the amount of food production per hectare, but also absolute environmental impacts should be taken into consideration. It is important to integrate in the analysis also the planetarian boundaries theory and the impact of conventional agriculture on critical thresholds. The very possibility to produce food in the long-term is at stake. Moreover, some aspects such as food transportation and distribution that concern any agriculture system should by examined in separate sessions and not be mentioned in the comparison between conventional and organic agriculture. Finally, regarding conventional livestock, it is necessary to take into account also animal wellbeing and the risk of epidemic outbreak in intensive farm, implying also serious risks for human health. The "one health" approach should be considered. No, because the argumentation is ideological and confused. More references could be added regarding planetary boundaries (https://www.stockholmresilience.org/research/planetary-boundaries.html) and one health approach (https://www.who.int/health-topics/one-health#tab=tab_1), as well as reference concerning the importance of achieving climate goals and to reduce absolute emissions in agriculture. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Several sentences are not scientifically correct, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Market structures and produce transportation are just two examples of the several sources of pollution connected to food production that may have a greater impact than the use of pesticides and fertilisers. [two topics mixed together: market structures and produce transportation must be tackled both by conventional and organic agriculture] Conventional operations actually show a lesser carbon footprint when the analysis is done using emissions per kilogramme of agricultural product or kilocalorie of food grown [the emissions related to pesticides and fertilizers production are not taken into account] 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arianna Lovera
Department, University & Country	Italy