

# **External Review Analysis - 3.3. Society**

## **Sub- Chapter - 3.3.1. Development**

Maria José P. L. Dos-Santos –  
DINÂMIA'CET – ISCTE-IUL. - ESCS –  
Instituto Politécnico de Lisboa, Portugal

# 1. Introduction

- I would like to thank all External Reviewers for their important considerations about the sub-chapter “Development” in terms of Editorial and Substance, that means minor and major revisions.
- Among the total of 34 external reviews received 5 of them (about 15%) reported to “Development” Sub-Chapter with important considerations and were made: namely:
- Very Important reviews, comments and suggestions about **Substance** were received. The majority of them are accurate and important contributions to improve this report. Indeed needs to take in account and change, the majority.
- Other considerations were done in terms of **Editorial**. The majority of them report mainly various types of gaps mainly on English language (majority) that conduct a difficult perception of ideas and needs a strong correction.

# 1. Introduction

- Other reviewers reports missing terms, explanation gaps, graphics missing, etc., consequence a seems very accurate, and of course needs to be inserted and object of consideration.

## 2. Substance Review – “Sub-chapter Development”

- Besides many comments was done as “substance” the majority of them just report cases of Editorial concerns. Ex:
- One common substance review reports connectivity among same parts of the “
- Reviewer 26: This chapter is very imbalanced in length : 17 pages for 3.3.1. Past trends and current situation and 2 for 3.3.2 Vulnerabilities, risks.
- My (and Reviewer Personal point of view here: Major Problem: Missing partially the final parts:
  - 1) 3.3.3.2. Projections, vulnerabilities and risks (partially done).
  - 2) 3.3.3.2. Adaptation (– Is possible to fulfill and insert now?
  - 3) All the report needs a strong revision to better integrate (tourism- other part on the report again) and solving the internal consistency among parts of the sub-chapter/Report

## 2. Substance Review – “Sub-chapter Development”

- Reviewer 26 – (from page 566 to 572)..Paragraph ... *The key to achieve this goal is economic growth. In other words, the priority of governments should be ....*
- Reviewer 26 – “This is a position that is strongly debated among economists. I don't think such an affirmation is needed here. “
- “Second, the questions discussed in this section - poverty and gender inequality - are not simply economic questions.
- Answer: Title is *Economics activities and their impact on gender inequalities and poverty*
- I would intitle the section "Poverty and gender inequalities". It should also be taken out of subsection 3.3.1.1.3 (economic dimension of SD). Third, there is a lot of repetition between the introductory page (566) and the following subsections. (Agree

## 2. Substance Review – “Sub-chapter Development”

- Reviewer: 1) “About the institutional framework of Development  
“This section is very much focused on human rights without much articulation to CC. Only 3 Med countries are discussed, plus Ireland “...
- Reviewer 1: “The pertinence of an **Irish** here example is also questionable”. (there are more questions- Anttonietta Elia, here...)
- Reviewer 21 - In line with a later remarks about the issue of justice and inequality (line 28, p. 617), it should be mentioned that the gap between, on the one hand, the formal institutional and legal framework and, on the other hand, actual social practices and uses, need further investigations by researchers in social sciences.

## 2. Substance Review – “Sub-chapter Development”

- **Reviewer 21** “This report may highlight the lack of data and case studies on socio-environmental inequalities (irreducible to income or gender inequalities mentioned below, p. 567-68), raising the issue of environmental justice.

- “For example, as regards coastal access for recreational uses, a statistical survey like the one conducted by a UCLA team on beach access in **California, (???)** may be launched to better figure out who is able to enjoy the Mediterranean coasts and who is de facto excluded.”

## 2. Substance Review – “Sub-chapter Development”

- Reviewer 35 – Some References are to hold and report examples based on the last decade, so, doesn't bring add value and novelty (as referred along the Report by other referee).
- Reviewer 27: Add some alternative References (ex:) For alternative indicators: Hilmi N., Safa A., Peridy N., Zemouri M., « An indicator of sustainable development for the MENA region », Topics in Middle Eastern and African Economies, Vol. 17, No. 1, May 2015.. Etc..

### **3. Editorial Review – “Sub-chapter Development”**

- As referred before the Editorial (minor Revisions) seems very accurate (majority of them).
- Mainly of them report English gaps of language and misunderstood paragraphs due that English language restriction.
- In my personal opinion (Annex 1 –Detailed information –world format) the majority of the suggestions (English language) should be followed (with care).
- Other refer missing legend of tables, (few examples), etc. but, the majority, reports English language failure.

## 4. Global Report - Substance review

- Other reviewers reports to the revision of the “Global Report”
- Here the main questions are:
- 1) Less of connectivity among the chapters and “I think the Manuscript in general lacks information on "connectivity". (please see file ***Darnaude \_External review General*** (external review) ;
- 2) **Reviewer 24** ... did, I suppose a *Plagiarism check* among all the report. Concerning to “Development sub-chapter” this analysis is very **accurate** (I tested and found missing references). Missing references is plagiarism, and I think all of us must take that in account this along all the Report indeed. The report can not be published with plagiarism, otherwise we lost our credibility.

## 4. Global Report - Substance review

3) Reviewer 28 ....\_ (IPCC-AR5 team)

- “...Indeed, much research is being carried out by diverse scientists from countries around the Mediterranean, though most of it is done by scientists from the Northern (and to some extent the Eastern) .....However, this is not the major aim of the MedEcc report on CC, as I construe it. “

- The report doesn't brings novelty to MED ..”specificities of “Most of the findings and policy prescriptions reported here are already found in the various IPCC reports maybe not digging enough into Mediterranean studies; but the messages regarding global warming in various part of the globe (1.5 or 2 deg. and beyond) have been for the most part loud and clear.

“I, for one, saw the potential NET contribution of this report in pointing out, briefly (for decision-makers) why the Mediterranean deserves special attention and treatment”

## 4. Global Report - Substance review

### 3) Reviewer 28 ....\_ (IPCC-AR5 team)

-”You asked – rightly so – that our response be concise. Would it then be also justified to ask the same from the editors of the document?

- Does the Report aim at the scientific community at large (besides the too long SPM, which, by the way, should also include officials from the Environment Ministries – p. 24).
- There are numerous instances that the material contained therein can be found elsewhere, and interested researchers would not need, or rely on, such material as contained in this Report. Thus, e.g., do we need here the discussion (pp. 26-27) on what is the proper base for extrapolating global warming? “

## 4. Global Report - Substance review

4) **Reviewer 29** – “Global Review: Given MAR1 intends to be an IPCC-like report for the Med, it could have used a table of content more similar to the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report. Given the length of the report it may have been more convenient and user friendly to split it into several reports as was done for IPCC Assessment”

**Reviewer 19:** “I think the Manuscript in general lacks information on "connectivity".

Reviewer 6 – “Case studies are only in some chapters”. The sub-chapter Development should have case studies of Development??

- Reviewer 13) Entire report                      Rather than “extreme events”, I would use “extreme weather events”

## 5. Editorial Global Review – *Minor Revision*

- Citation formatting: we should consider along the report:  
et al. Or et al.,
- Tables formatting ? Uniformization style?
- Final of each Chapter/sub-Chapter a List of Abbreviations used should be included?
- - Case studies must be presented in all the Chapters and sub-chapters (one Referee reports that)????
- Now are present just in some cases.

**Thanks so much!**  
**Suggestions are welcome!!!**