Paper: **"Well-being and climate change: Evidence for Portugal"**

Corresponding Author: Ary José A. Souza-Jr.

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Janaka Jayawickrama
University of York, United Kingdom

Reviewer 2: Alexandre Rodrigo Choupina Andrade Silva
Federal University of Jataí (UFJ), Brazil

Reviewer 3: Rajasekhar Venkata Kali
University of Hyderabad, India

Reviewer 4: Oxana Bayer
Dnipropetrovsk Oles Honchar University, Ukraine

Reviewer F:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Delete: "Subjective" of Title.

Well-being and climate change: Evidence for Portugal.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

No

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes. However, it is necessary to add the statistical software to the database

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Insert tables and figures after the citation in the text.

Reviewer H:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes the title is clear and explain the content of this article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Abstract is clear and I have a minor suggestion. Please see the attachment.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The language is very good. However, a thorough edit of the article may be useful.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are appropriate and clear to understand.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

I am not familiar with the equations, which needs someone with knowledge to check. However, the article flows well and read logically.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is clear and explain how the aim of this article was achieved.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

There is a good set of references at the end.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This is really a good paper and a valuable contribution. I have included my comments and suggestions within the paper, which would be helpful in improving the quality of this paper.

Reviewer N:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes, the title is clear and it clearly encompasses the intended content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, the abstract is well written and is able to include all those objects, methods and results of the study.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The language is clear and no grammatical errors and spell mistakes identified.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, clearly explained.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is very clear and was explained with clarity and vision.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Well written conclusions and recommendations.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes, the references seems comprehensive and also very appropriate for the study.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

No special suggestions are needed to authors. However, a small suggestion is that it would be good to avoid writing the sentences like "through ANOVA I can reject", instead the result may be narrated as there are significant differences as ANOVA indicates ..... hence null hypothesis may be rejected".

Reviewer P:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes, it is.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

I would say the abstract is a bit sophisticated.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The paper is very well written. There are just a few occasional flaws of the language.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, they are.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes, it is.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

I would say the Results session might contain mere calculations whereas the Discussion session might contain references to other research, comments, and explanations.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes, it is. (I believe the editorial board are to present uniform demands to how reference list is to be formatted).

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

A brilliant research, congratulations!