

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_75201
Title of the Manuscript:	CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENTS IN ENVIRONMENTAL LAW: AN INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>This article is a conceptual work on the situation regarding environmental conservation and the urgent need to take effective measures to protect it, this situation, according to the author (s) being a sign of the present times. The topic debated is considered a deep one, given the rapid worsening of the climate crisis.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The abstract of the paper is rather an introduction. An abstract should contain essential data about the subject of the following paper, such as where the idea of the article came from, how and with what methods the author (s) had at hand in the presentation of that subject, the bibliography used and so on. Therefore I recommend the author (s) to redo this part. - The author(s) refers to the current crisis of environmental conservation, of climate change occurred as a result of human activity(s). This is very true! But the bibliography used by the author(s) of this paper contains only 2 more current bibliographic notes (more precisely 2 from 2020). Perhaps it would not be bad if this aspect were revised and the bibliography was completed with much more current titles, as the topic in the field exists in the specialized literature. - Also, the chapter Conclusions is deficient, because the author(s) does not refer to the conclusions that are intertwined in the content of the presented paper, but dressed this chapter in a kind of mythological story. Not enough! This part of the work must be remade; otherwise we will be able to say that we are reading a mythological story, and not a scientific one, because this kind of conclusion leaves the reader's imagination free to finish the story described above in the body of the work. The author (s) must distinguish between a scientific and a literary work. - The precautionary principle discussed in this paper is a very good topic. However, the author (ii) must combine this general principle with others specific to environmental protection legislation and procedures, namely: The principle of prevention of ecological risks and damage; Guarantee the right to consult in order to take decisions on environmental legislation and regulations. It's important to get these together, because all of them principles represent principles of a legislative nature, not being susceptible to violation by private persons. And the author(s) doesn't make this conjunction between them. I suggest a closer approach to all these principles and to the way of working together by those entitled to make decisions on the conservation and / or saving of natural resources, without major economic implications. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>The author(s) must rephrase some of the paragraphs as it was suggested by comments so that they will be clearer for the readers. Also, would be great if the author(s) will try to make a more deep analysis on the subject described in the paper for further.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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:	<i>Popoviciu Gabriela</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Universitatea din Oradea, Romania</i>