

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_126924
Title of the Manuscript:	Navigating the Complexities of Climate Justice: The Loss and Damage Fund in Focus
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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	I liked manuscript because has significantly impacted the human wellbeing and there should be need to focus on fund allocation.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The Loss and Damage due to climate change: Focus on Fund allocation.	
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.	This paper sentence in abstract repeated twice should be deleted. Short form like (CoP27)and (UNFCCC) should be deleted.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Voice for Loss and Damage Fund: A Step towards Climate Justice Subsection full form of UNFCCC must write first, it has written in later pages.	
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.	The primary data is collected by person (investigator) himself by going there but it has written that The primary data was collected from documents.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	1) Sovacool, B. K., Clifford, H., Pearl-Martinez, R., Gause, E., Braun, D., Kamareddine, L., ... & Wellenius, G. A. (2024). Critically examining research funding patterns for climate change and human health. <i>npj Climate Action</i> , 3(1), 64. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44168-024-00142-0 2) Gabbatiss, J., & Dunne, D. (2023, November 7)- November 7 delete, mention only year 3) Müller (2018), Van Druenen et al. (2019), Schalatek and Bird (2017), Graham and Serdaru (2018), (Lakhani, 2023), (Patz, 2005). (Elia, 2023), (Robert & Pelling, 2018). (UNCTAD, 2023), (Nyamu, 2024) References missing.	
Minor REVISION comments	Make English quality of the article easier to understand.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Mentioned COP several times but full form not given	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rajesh Sudhakar Wakchaure
Department, University & Country	Dau Shri Vasudev Chandrakar Kamdhenu Vishwavidyalaya, India