

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_121933</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Global Impacts of Extended COVID-19 Lockdowns: Intersecting Perspectives on Environmental Quality, Food Security, Human Health, and Societal Dynamics</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This is a commentary paper on the lockdowns during Covid19 pandemic. It is good that somebody writes such a comment, critically analysing the measures of our government. Therefore I could recommend for publication. But I have some serious critical observations. See attachment at end of document</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>OK</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>OK</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>OK</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>There is no science in the manuscript. No hypothesis was tested or proposed. It is a political opinion.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>OK, at some places the anecdotal evidence should have references.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>OK. At some places Capitals were used where they shouldn't have been used.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>This is a commentary paper on the lockdowns during Covid19 pandemic. It is good that somebody writes such a comment, critically analysing the measures of our government. Therefore I could recommend for publication. But I have some serious critical observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The paper was written during the pandemic itself (which was already declared over on May 23, 2023 <a href="https://news.un.org/en/story/2023/05/1136367">https://news.un.org/en/story/2023/05/1136367</a>). It is not sure if readers are much interested in hearing an opinion that is by now stale, with for instance predictions for the economy (p. 20) that is now already far in the past. The author(s) should update their manuscript. To start with, changing from present tense to past tense in the texts. Update the knowledge. Ideally with new references.</li> <li>- The arguments are very anecdotal. Giving examples there where they help the argument. Authors saying things like that water in Venice became clearer. To make the document more scientific it would rather need a statement that "On a world scale waters of cities became &lt;x&gt; clearer, as measured by &lt;y&gt; property, done by these scientists: &lt;z&gt;". In any case, even these anecdotal evidence should have references. Science should be able to be verified, and not based on trusting the author(s).</li> <li>- CO2 is mentioned as a "pollutant" in the manuscript several times. CO2 is not a pollutant, it is a gas of life. About the effect on the climate one can argue.</li> <li>- KNMI is the Royal Dutch Meteorological Institute (p.8).</li> <li>- (p.1) Napoleon was in the 18th - 19th century and generally not considered fascist. The world wars were in the 20th century and not 21st, the same for Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Some excessive use of Capitals.</li> <li>- Since the document is about the measures against Covid, the author(s) are advised to not make statements about Covid itself. Examples are writing "While essential for controlling the virus spread, the lockdowns ...". This is probably outside the area of research of the authors. They should therefore write (emphasis by me) "While deemed essential for controlling the spread of the virus, the lockdowns ...". Likewise, (p.5) "Though critical ..." should be "Thought critical ...". I will reject the manuscript on this, or the author(s) should prove their claim. See also the point above; the manuscript was written during the pandemic and at that time the governments thought the lockdowns were necessary and thought 'better safe than sorry', not realizing the tremendous negative effects lockdowns have on society. Since then we have learned a lot. Note also that Sweden, as one of the few countries, did not take severe measures and nothing bad seem to have come of it. With this fortunate piece of data we can say that the lockdowns were fully unnecessary. Along the same lines: Wording like "health crisis" (p.4). In retrospect, it was a mere health threat; the crisis was caused by the governments (for instance the financial crisis – inflation -- that predictably followed the governmental "stimulus packages" [p.5]). The mortality was that of a common flu (of which yearly 2 million people worldwide die). The author(s) are free to disagree, but when they make a contrary statement in a manuscript, it should be well documented.</li> <li>- Fig. 1 is illegible</li> <li>- The document is at some places repetitive. Like on p.10 it is going back to air quality.</li> <li>- In section 5 on p. 23 the author(s) make a 'summary for policy makers' basically rolling out the communist agenda, the globalist United Nations Agenda 2030. This is once again an abuse of a crisis for political gain. As Churchill said, "Never let a good crisis go to waste". It is fully misplaced in a scientific journal and contrasts sharply with what the authors set out to do, to give an objective</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>summary of the measures. It is revealed here they are simply pushing a political agenda. This section must be scrapped, or the objectives stated better in the abstract and introduction that it will state that the authors will show how politics must change because of what the pandemic has revealed. Also then the conclusions must not state “has been a defining global health crisis”, but “has been a defining global governance crisis”, which in fact it turned out to be in hindsight.</p> <p>- The word ‘sustainability’ appears in the manuscript without it in any way being relevant to the presented work. Hitched on as a caboose to the political train.</p>	
--	---	--

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer’s comment</b>	<b>Author’s comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Peter Stallinga
Department, University & Country	University of The Algarve, Portugal