

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55950

Title: India in Global Climate Negotiations: Insights from Belem (COP30)

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity			✓	
Significance			✓	

Reviewer Name: **ANAPANA GOPAL**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

General Comments

The manuscript offers a timely and policy-relevant examination of India's role in global climate negotiations, with a particular focus on COP30 (Belém). The topic is highly relevant given the tenth anniversary of the Paris Agreement and the growing expectations placed on emerging economies. The paper demonstrates strong familiarity with climate diplomacy literature and presents India as a norm-shaping actor rather than a passive participant. Overall, the study is informative and well-grounded, but it would benefit from clearer methodological rigor, tighter language, and stronger critical engagement with COP30 outcomes.

Content and Originality

The paper's originality lies in its India-centric assessment of COP30 outcomes, framed explicitly through long-standing principles such as CBDR, equity, climate justice, and historical responsibility. While much of the historical analysis draws from existing scholarship, the integration of COP30 outcomes into India's negotiation trajectory adds novelty.

However, the analysis is largely interpretive and descriptive, relying heavily on secondary narratives and official positions. The originality would be strengthened by:

- A clearer articulation of the research gap
- More critical interrogation of whether COP30 truly advances India's priorities or merely symbolically aligns with them
- Explicit comparison with previous COP outcomes (e.g., COP26–COP28) to highlight what is substantively new at COP30

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Technical Quality

The manuscript employs a qualitative, document-based methodology, which is appropriate for policy and diplomacy analysis. However, the methodology section is underdeveloped.

Key concerns:

- Data sources (UNFCCC documents, WRI reports, scholarly articles) are mentioned but selection criteria are not explained
- The analytical framework ("India's negotiation lens") is conceptually referenced but not operationalized
- No clear explanation of how COP30 texts were analyzed (discourse analysis? thematic coding?)

Strengthening methodological transparency would significantly improve the paper's technical robustness.

Language and Presentation

The language is generally clear and academic, but the manuscript requires careful copy-editing.

Common issues include:

- Typographical errors (e.g., "clearoperational," "analysethem," "ti")
- Inconsistent spacing and punctuation
- Occasional repetition of phrases such as *equity*, *CBDR*, and *historical responsibility* without analytical progression
- Overly long sentences that reduce clarity

While the tone is appropriate for a scholarly journal, improved concision and grammatical polishing are necessary.

Structure and Organization

The paper follows a logical and standard structure (Abstract → Introduction → Methodology → Literature Review → Analysis → Conclusion). The historical segmentation of India's climate diplomacy is particularly effective.

However:

- The Literature Review is disproportionately long compared to the Methodology
- The transition from literature review to COP30 analysis could be smoother
- Subsections under COP30 analysis would benefit from clearer signposting and synthesis, not just alignment statements

The conclusion is strong but could more explicitly discuss policy implications and future research directions.

References and Citations

The reference list is comprehensive, current, and relevant, drawing from peer-reviewed journals, authoritative books, and credible institutional reports (UNFCCC, WRI, ORF).

Minor issues include:

- Inconsistent spacing in author names (e.g., "&Ratha," "&Muhkia")
- Occasional citation redundancy
- Some web sources lack access dates (if required by journal style)

Overall, referencing quality is good and supports the paper's arguments well.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Overall Recommendation

The manuscript makes a valuable contribution to the literature on climate diplomacy and India's evolving global role. With revisions focused on methodological clarity, critical depth, and language refinement, it has strong potential for publication in a journal focusing on international relations, environmental politics, or climate governance.

Final Decision:

Minor Revisions Required

The paper is publishable in principle, but substantial revisions are necessary to strengthen:

- Methodological rigor
- Analytical depth (beyond descriptive alignment)
- Language accuracy and presentation quality

Once revised, the manuscript would stand as a solid and timely contribution to climate negotiation scholarship.