Review: Sustainability-1725125

Early on in the paper, you should note that the case study is quite specific to historically dense and fine-grained urban core; the framework introduced seems minimally translatable to more contemporary or spacious urban environs.
63-64: "…the management of this problem is strictly related to the characteristics of the single territories…" Are there no cases where external forces acting on a territory contribute to internal challenges in achieving cycle closure?
67: Explain "sedimented"; ease up on the jargon so as to expand the range of interested readers.
84: Isn't there a broader range of action needed in the urban landscape than just "protection"?
99: And economic dimensions too?
In figure 1, where does impact of waste on human physiological health come in?
153-157: The semantic differences between "much higher", "strongly higher" and "extremely higher" seem minimal to me. And all of these are contained within the term "higher". Such sorting terms usually are limited to fewer gradations precisely because there aren't adequate words to denote 'higher-ness' in the English language. Perhaps try something like: equal < minimally higher < moderately higher < strongly higher < extremely higher
Table 1: What is "unicity"?
173-174: "following table" is unclear; where is it? Have a numbered table, and refer to the table # in the text.
177: explain aij element when first referenced.
201: Explain somewhere around here why compromission should happen, and how/when it might occur.
Figure 2 uses the term "typological" perhaps in the way architects 'typologize' built form components. Yet more broadly (and correctly), "typological" could apply to other branches of the table as well.
214-215: "…panoramic perception by extraneous elements" is confusing. Elaborate. Similarly, what does "total fruition of the space" (223) involve? Strive for clearer, simpler expressions.

241-242: In addition to “user discomfort” what about actual and direct and indirect impacts on human health from air- and water-borne pathogens, vermin, etc.? I would think that direct harm to human health is at least as important an evaluative factor as whether the refuse is unsightly and causes passing sensory disruption. At least acknowledge that you aren’t considering these essential factors.
256: incentivizes?
260: Acoustic impacts: give some concrete examples so that this section doesn’t seem so abstract.
363: “..common linguistic-formal characteristics”? Elaborate, or provide lay terms.
382: “driveways” connote various things in different regions. Try a basic road hierarchy approach (arterial, collector, local, cartway...)
391: “pax”?
437: “linguistic-formal”? Such jargon injects unnecessary and vague allusions, and detracts from the text.
490: These programs seem important; provide more context and specifics.
493: So what causes this ‘migration’?
Figure 5: Most readers will appreciate the visual tangibility of these images. I’d suggest enlarging them a bit into a 2x2 matrix.
529: “fruition” is a peculiar word; it’s been used repeatedly, and I think a better term could be found.
538-539: Provide references for this paragraph. Tangible programs and initiatives are key; elaborate.
557: The vacuum system needs to be contextualized in this section early on, or otherwise it appears to be a technology conceived by the author. Who first conceived of the system? Who is the primary manufacturer/supplier? Be up front, and clarify the extent to which this technology is already in use elsewhere. A single reference (29) is not sufficient; spell it out in the text.
Figure 7: I hate to ask, but shouldn’t the table be entirely in English? Figure 8 likewise.
804: “..valorizing an autopoietic reality..” Simplify. Don’t force the reader to keep a dictionary at the ready.
809-812: Why the late emphasis on social capital? I agree that it’s an essential factor, but the only other reference to (cultural) capital is on line 99. You must include this concept in the introduction if you raise it in the conclusion.