Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JESBS_110900**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Public Interest Litigation in Climate Justice: Chinese Mode of EPIL in Transnational Climate Disputes**
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**1. The "climate litigation" is an important category the emerge in the social field and it is crucial for climate policymakers and NGO.** **2. Yes.** 3. **Abstract**: The author should improve (optimize) the abstract (incluing a better methodological strategy used and main considerations). For example, the categories "right to a healthy" or "right to information" are cited in the Abstract, but they disappear in the article content / discussion. **4. The subsections are to splited (e.g. "2.1 Public Trust » with a lot of sub titles « The doctrine of public trust", "Government as Trustee", "Obligation to Prevent Harm" and so on, kind of disconnected inside this subsection. That kind of internal subsection structure is the same in others subsections (e.g. 2.2 Common But Differentiated Responsibilities (CBDR), and so son). Could be structured in broader clusters sub-sections/sub titles.** **5. Yes.** **6. Yes.**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	1. Yes.	
Optional/General comments	-	

Review Form 1.7

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Frederico Salmi**
Department, University & Country	**Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil**