

### 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	

#### **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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The manuscript offers significant contribution towards the discourse on the complex area of climate change justice and the equitable and fair distribution of climate aid. The subject matter being very crucial and pertaining the future of the earth and human kind, the research undertaken by the author is commendable. A detailed study of the historical development of the Loss and Damage Fund has been undertaken in the manuscript. The problematic area of the responsibility of the Global North in global temperature rise and the vulnerability of geographical areas with least contribution to the climate change scenario has also been well documented. The problems in the fair distribution of L&D financing have been neatly identified and the need for an alternative framework has been put forth.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes. The abstract seems to be clear and comprehensive and covers the major aspects of the article.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections are appropriate but the sections and subsections can be more clearly numbered or divided for more clarity and easier comprehension.	
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 manuscript is a well researched and clear text. The subject matter dealt with is the large scale lack of consensus on the eligibility of countries in receiving L&D financial aid and the requirement for the developed countries and historical emitters in contributing to L&D Fund. The debate is ongoing in social, academic and international spheres and a general consensus upon this is crucial for the wellbeing of nations. Therefore, the manuscript can be considered scientifically significant and relevant.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable except for some minor grammatical and punctuation errors especially in the introductory part. The need for proof reading and editing is perceived so that the occasional lack of continuity and clarity can be rectified. Eg: the spelling of "foggy" is not consistent in all entries.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Pros: Good quality article. Relevant subject matter. Well Researched Cons: Lack of clarity at some points. Loss of focus while giving the historical perspectives. (Both can be rectified with proper editing and proof reading)	

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Silpa Anand S
Department, University & Country	University of Calicut, Kerala. Little Flower College, India