

**Paper: “Echoes of the Anthropocene: Reimagining Legal Consciousness in the Face of Ecological Crisis”**

**Submitted: 08 September 2024**

**Accepted: 07 December 2024**

**Published: 31 December 2024**

Corresponding Author: Chrysoula Kapartziani

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n35p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n35p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: José Noronha Rodrigues  
University of the Azores, Portugal

Reviewer 2: Dragica Vujadinović  
University of Belgrade, Serbia

Reviewer 3: Blinded

### ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

*ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

|  |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Reviewer Name:<br>José Noronha Rodrigues   |                               |
| University/Country: Universidade dos Açores - Portugal   |                               |
| Date Manuscript Received: 29/09/2024   | Date Review Report Submitted: |
| Manuscript Title: Echoes of the Anthropocene , through the keyhole of Law consciousness  |                               |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0977/24   |                               |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:  |                               |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:<br>You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: |                               |

#### Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

| Questions  | Rating Result<br>[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|--|---|
| <b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>   | <b>4</b>                                |
| <i>The title, "Echoes of the Anthropocene through the keyhole of Law consciousness," is evocative but could be refined to better reflect the core content and arguments presented in the article. It captures the intersection between environmental shifts (Anthropocene) and legal consciousness, but it might benefit from being clearer and more descriptive for an academic audience. (Please insert your comments)</i> |   |
| <b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>   | <b>3</b>                                |
| <i>The abstract in the document provides a comprehensive overview of the themes and concepts discussed in the article, but it could be more structured to clearly highlight the objectives, methods, and results of the study</i>  |   |

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| <i>In the keyword section, "Antropocene" should be corrected to "Anthropocene." Consider unifying terminologies. For example, the terms "Antropocene," "Anthropocene," and "Chthulucene" are all used, and while these may have distinct meanings in some contexts, if they are used interchangeably, ensure that the distinction is clear.</i>  |          |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>   | <b>3</b> |
| <i>The document does not clearly outline the study methods used, making it difficult to discern the research approach and methodology applied. While it discusses various theoretical frameworks and references numerous sources, the methodological framework is not explicitly defined.</i>  |          |
| <b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>   | <b>3</b> |
| <i>The document is dense and interdisciplinary, but the results are not distinctly highlighted or clearly defined, making it challenging to identify specific conclusions or findings. Instead, the document presents a complex narrative that interweaves theoretical concepts, historical analysis, and legal case studies (such as the Whanganui River in New Zealand) to build a broader argument.</i> |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| <i>The conclusions of the document are consistent with the arguments presented throughout the text, but there are a few aspects to refine to improve clarity and alignment.</i>  |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>  | <b>3</b> |
| <i>The references included in the document are comprehensive and demonstrate a deep engagement with a wide range of sources, both classical and contemporary. However, there are a few issues and areas for improvement to consider, particularly regarding citation consistency and source relevance.</i>   |          |

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed               |          |
| Accepted, minor revision needed            | <b>x</b> |
| Return for major revision and resubmission |          |
| Reject                                     |          |

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Consistency in Spacing:**In the title "Echoes of the Anthropocene through the keyhole of Law consciousness," there is a double space between "Anthropocene" and "through." Also, similar spacing issues can be found throughout the text. It would be beneficial to ensure that spacing between words is consistent.

**Use of Abbreviations and Parentheses:** When using abbreviations like "UNESCO," it would be good to spell them out the first time with the abbreviation in parentheses. The same applies to references like "RAMSAR Convention on Biodiversity."

**Citation Consistency:** The document frequently cites references (e.g., "Chakrabarty, 2009, p. 197-222"). It would be helpful to standardize the citation format and clarify it further, depending on the style guide (APA, MLA, Chicago) you are adhering to.

**Flow and Redundancy:** Some sections, particularly when defining "legal culture" and "legal consciousness," tend to be repetitive. It might help to streamline definitions and remove redundancies for clarity and conciseness.

**Quotation Marks and Parentheses:** There are a few sentences where quotation marks or parentheses are either missing or misplaced. A review for punctuation around quotes and references would help.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**