

OPEN PEER REVIEW

# The Utilitarian Approach to Environmental Law: Balancing Costs and Benefits

Sepehr. Khajeh Naeeni<sup>1\*</sup> <sup>1</sup> Department of Chemical Engineering, Lakehead University, 955 Oliver Road, Thunder Bay, ON P7B 5E1, Canada


\* Corresponding author email address: skhajeh@lakeheadu.ca

Received: 2022-10-04

Revised: 2022-11-08

Accepted: 2022-11-13

Published: 2023-01-01

**EDITOR:**Abdus Samad Assistant Professor, Department of Law, AWKUM, Pakistan  
abdussamad@awkum.edu.pk**REVIEWER 1:**Agwu Sunday Okoro Lecturer & Clinical Law Administrator at Baze University Abuja, Abuja, Nigeria  
agwuokoro@gmail.com**REVIEWER 2:**Mehmet Yaşar Department of Sociology, Boğaziçi University, 34342 Bebek, Istanbul, Turkey  
mehmetyasardo@bogazici.edu.tr

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The transition between sections, especially from the utilitarian approach to alternative ethical frameworks, could be smoother to maintain the narrative's flow. Introducing transitional sentences that highlight the interconnectedness of these ethical considerations would enhance the manuscript's coherence.

While the manuscript effectively outlines various ethical approaches, it could benefit from a more nuanced analysis of how these theories intersect with current environmental challenges, such as climate change, biodiversity loss, and resource depletion. This would underscore the practical implications of adopting a pluralistic ethical stance.

Some sections feature dense paragraphs that could be broken down for better readability. Shorter paragraphs, along with the use of subheadings within sections, would improve the manuscript's accessibility.

There are a few instances where technical terms and concepts are introduced without sufficient explanation. Providing brief definitions or clarifications would make the paper more accessible to readers less familiar with ethical theories or environmental law jargon.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

### 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In discussing the limitations of utilitarianism, the manuscript could incorporate a discussion on emerging ethical considerations in environmental law, such as intergenerational justice and the rights of nature. This inclusion would reflect the evolving nature of environmental ethics discussions.

The conclusion could be strengthened by offering more concrete recommendations for policymakers and practitioners. While the call for a pluralistic approach is clear, specific guidance on how to implement this in policy-making processes would be invaluable.

Consider suggesting frameworks or methodologies for evaluating and integrating different ethical perspectives into environmental law and policy. This could include decision-making tools or criteria for balancing conflicting ethical considerations.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.