




OPEN PEER REVIEW

Constitutionalizing Nature: Legal Innovations in the Anthropocene

Rajeev. Kumar¹, Camila. Rodríguez^{2*}, Diego. Álvarez³¹ Department of Public Law, University of Delhi, Delhi, India² Department of Law, Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia³ Department of Political Science, Universidad Mayor de San Andrés, La Paz, Bolivia

* Corresponding author email address: camila.rodriguez@uniandes.edu.co

Received: 2024-10-09	Revised: 2024-12-08	Accepted: 2024-12-14	Published: 2025-01-01
EDITOR: Richard Dodder  Emeritus Professor of Sociology and of Statistics, Oklahoma State University Stillwater, Oklahoma, USA. Email: rdodder@hotmail.com			
REVIEWER 1: Mehmet Çevik  Department of Social Sciences, Ankara University, Türkiye. Email: mehmetcevik@asbu.edu.tr			
REVIEWER 2: Nabeel Bani-Hani  Faculty of Education Specialization, Wasit University, Wasit, Iraq. Email: nabeelhani@uowasit.edu.iq			

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

This is an important argument but could benefit from briefly defining what “traditional anthropocentric frameworks” entail in legal terms to aid interdisciplinary readers.

Terms like “eco-constitutionalism,” “rights of nature,” and “Earth jurisprudence” are sometimes used interchangeably. Please consider clarifying their distinctions early and maintaining terminological consistency throughout.

Please elaborate more on Epstein’s core argument—how does this reconfiguration manifest in legal theory or practice?

The Vilcabamba River case in Ecuador is mentioned but not analyzed in depth. Please provide details of the court’s reasoning and outcomes to illustrate the significance of this ruling more clearly.

While challenges are discussed generally, it would be helpful to give concrete examples from case law or policy failures where constitutional nature rights failed in implementation.

The link between domestic eco-constitutionalism and international law could be enhanced by citing more examples of legal borrowing or harmonization efforts (e.g., regional human rights courts, UNEP, IUCN).

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The research objective is implied but not clearly stated. Please add a direct sentence such as: “This study aims to...” to clearly demarcate the goal of the paper.

The description of the review method would be strengthened by providing an exact number of sources analyzed and how they were selected or excluded in each review stage.

The Indian Supreme Court’s stay is noted, but the legal reasoning for the reversal is missing. Please expand on the institutional or doctrinal objections to the Uttarakhand decision.

The mention of “Wild Law” and “Earth Jurisprudence” is excellent, but their distinct philosophical foundations could be expanded. A brief comparative sentence would enhance conceptual clarity.

Consider including a comparative table summarizing the constitutional or legal instruments, scope of nature’s rights, and key mechanisms across the five countries for better analytical synthesis.

The influence of indigenous epistemologies is highlighted but could be expanded to discuss how legal pluralism is operationalized in practice—especially in Bolivia and New Zealand.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.