

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_126924
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Navigating the Complexities of Climate Justice: The Loss and Damage Fund in Focus</b>
Type of the Article	Review Paper

#### 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>

#### 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)
<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>	This manuscript is an important contribution to the scientific community, especially in the realm of climate finance and climate justice. It addresses critical governance issues within the Loss and Damage Fund, providing valuable insights into the complexities of accountability and financial mechanisms needed to support vulnerable nations affected by climate change. The analysis of historical versus current responsibilities for emissions, along with the challenges of procedural transparency and equitable fund allocation, makes this work relevant for policymakers and researchers alike. By highlighting gaps in the current financial structure, the manuscript sheds light on essential improvements needed for the Fund to achieve its intended goals effectively, which could inspire further research and inform future climate policy discussions.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes	
<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>	Clarify the paper's specific focus areas in the context of the Loss and Damage Fund, such as governance challenges, financial mechanisms, and the effectiveness of the fund distribution criteria. For example: <i>"This paper examines the governance and financial challenges of the Loss and Damage Fund, focusing on accountability, fund allocation criteria, and equitable access for vulnerable states."</i> Highlight the intended outcomes of the analysis—whether the paper aims to provide recommendations for policy reform, identify gaps, or suggest improvements in fund operationalization.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Overall, the manuscript would benefit from structured subsections that address the specific aspects of financial, governance, and distribution challenges. This structure would provide a clear, comprehensive exploration of the Loss and Damage Fund's role and limitations in achieving climate justice for vulnerable nations.	
<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>	This manuscript demonstrates scientific rigor and technical soundness by drawing on established frameworks such as climate justice, the Paris Agreement, and the principles of common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR). The author has carefully examined the financial mechanisms and governance structures surrounding the Loss and Damage Fund, linking them to broader climate justice concerns and global equity. The integration of qualitative research methods, along with references to key works in climate finance, supports the manuscript's credibility and theoretical robustness. Furthermore, the paper acknowledges the intricacies and challenges inherent in implementing such funds, reflecting a deep understanding of the complexities involved in international climate finance and policy-making. This balanced and evidence-based approach enhances the manuscript's scientific correctness, making it a valuable contribution to ongoing debates in the field.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references cited in the manuscript appear to be a solid foundation for the discussion, drawing from reputable sources that address key aspects of the Loss and Damage Fund, climate justice, and international climate finance mechanisms. However, the references could be further strengthened by including more recent publications, particularly those from 2022 and 2023, to reflect the latest developments and	

**Review Form 3**

<p>:</p>	<p>discussions surrounding the Loss and Damage Fund, especially in light of COP28 and recent climate policy shifts.</p> <p>Additionally, references could be included that specifically cover case studies or recent evaluations of similar financial mechanisms, such as the Adaptation Fund or the Green Climate Fund, to provide comparative insights into the operational challenges of these funds. Including works that focus on the political dynamics and shifting global climate policies in 2023-2024 would provide more current context to the manuscript's discussions.</p> <p>Suggested additional references could include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Tobin, L., &amp; McCarthy, J. (2023).</b> "Lessons from the Green Climate Fund: Governance and Funding Challenges." <i>Climate Policy</i>, 23(2), 100-115.</li> <li><b>Chakraborty, S., &amp; Chowdhury, S. (2023).</b> "Loss and Damage Financing: A Critical Review of the International Negotiations and Implications for Vulnerable Nations." <i>Environmental Policy and Governance</i>, 33(1), 89-105.</li> <li><b>Pekkarinen, M., et al. (2024).</b> "Governance Mechanisms in Climate Finance: A Post-COP28 Analysis." <i>Global Environmental Change</i>, 73, 102-118.</li> </ol> <p>These references would offer more recent perspectives and case study-based insights, making the manuscript even more relevant to current discussions in the field.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language and English quality of the manuscript is generally suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear and coherent, with a formal tone appropriate for academic discourse. However, some sections could benefit from minor revisions to enhance clarity and flow.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript does not seem to raise direct ethical issues in its content, but there are some underlying ethical considerations related to the subject matter that could be addressed more explicitly. These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Equity and Climate Justice:</b> The manuscript touches on the principle of "common but differentiated responsibilities" (CBDR) and the need for developed nations to bear greater responsibility for funding the Loss and Damage Fund. The ethical implications of this principle could be explored more deeply, particularly in relation to the fairness of climate financing and the responsibility of high-emission nations to compensate developing nations that have contributed the least to climate change but are the most vulnerable to its impacts.</li> <li><b>Vulnerable Populations:</b> While the paper discusses the importance of the Loss and Damage Fund for vulnerable nations, ethical questions around who qualifies as "vulnerable" could be more thoroughly examined. Ensuring that the most at-risk populations, such as marginalized communities and indigenous groups within vulnerable countries, are adequately represented and prioritized in the allocation of funds would be an important ethical consideration.</li> <li><b>Accountability in Fund Distribution:</b> The manuscript touches on governance issues but could expand on the ethical responsibility of how the funds are distributed. Transparency, fairness, and accountability are crucial to ensure that funds reach the communities most affected by climate change, without being diverted by political or financial interests.</li> </ol> <p>By addressing these ethical aspects more explicitly, the manuscript could provide a more comprehensive examination of the moral dimensions involved in the Loss and Damage Fund, highlighting the importance of ensuring equity, justice, and fairness in climate finance.</p>	

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Shubhika Goel</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Govind Ballabh Pant University of Agriculture &amp; Technology, India</b></p>