**Introduction**

5. Effective opening quote.

6. “…green living is not just a collection of eco-friendly practices. It’s an ethos, a way of life, and an ethics of care that inform an embodied and transformative politics. Such transformative activism empowers ordinary people to navigate the challenges of environmental and social sustainability, well-being, and relationality in the Anthropocene.” Well-stated.

7. So the green living movement emerged in 2010s?

8. I find this methodological intervention compelling, but your argument feels incomplete. How *did* you structure your research if the green living movement is so dispersed? How does this effect what you can and can’t say about their impact on Hong Kong?

9. Improve readability by using direct quotes more sparingly.

10. I’m not sure how to square this critique of anthropology with the paragraph on page 12 that begins “Moreover, it is vital to consider “the diverse meanings and enactments” of responsibility beyond the theory of neoliberal responsibilization (Trnka and Trundle 2017, 3),” which suggests that anthropologists have explored individuals’ capacity for impact. Perhaps I’m missing something?

11. I find this compelling, but think it would help to split this into two separate discussions/critiques, one about the study of environmental activism and one regarding the work of environmental activism (though obviously there is overlap). As you go onto show, there are scholars who are thinking more critically (generously?) about the neoliberal subject. However, I agree that the “all or nothing mindset” remains prevalent in society. This latter point could be a great place to end the introduction, in fact.

- “Ultimately, these problems are rooted in an all-or-nothing mindset that is so prevalent—but detrimental—to our discussions of social and climate issues. This binary approach pits concepts against each other: rich versus poor, individual versus structural, superficial versus radical, personal versus political. But we all know that reality seldom sits at two poles.” Well put. I recommend cutting straight to your next paragraph “In this book, I take issue with…” rather than citing Trnka and Trundle, and Lazar. Your own words are enough.

12. “I hope to shift our attention from the streets to the selves, challenging the idea that only high-profile social movements are credible agents of social change” Main argument?

13-14. Second argument about embodied politics? Intriguing.

14-16. Third thread: moral exemplars.

17. Recommend dropping the chapter summary or revising it to do more than simply summarize the chapters. As written, does not add anything to the introduction.

General comment: I think there is a lot of good materials here. You do a nice job of introducing the green living movement (lifestyle?), as well as situating your project in work on environmental activism, embodied politics, and moral subjectivity. However, there’s a disconnect between the questions/ideas you raise in the introduction and what you go onto explore in the body chapters. This could reflect a need to more clearly state your arguments in the body chapters, or to revise the introduction to better reflect the rest of the manuscript.

**Chapter 1**

18-19. Not sure this paragraph (“Prior to the series of protests in 2019…) accomplishes what you want it to.

20. Recommend rephrasing direct quotes in your own words so you can move the citation to the end of the paragraph and improve readability. Alternatively, incorporate scholars into text, e.g. “As XXXscholarsXXX have revealed…”

30. This idea about the relationship between identifying as a Hongkonger and environmental work seems important and worthy of more attention/fleshing out.

General comments: I think this chapter would work better if organized in a more straightforward chronological fashion, rather than jumping between the colonial and recent past. That would make it easier for readers to grasp how thoughts about the environment have progressed, especially those new to the topic (i.e. students). As is, I don’t have a clear sense of HK’s history or how green people fit into it.

**Chapter 2**

37. May be worthwhile to revisit sections structured around individual activists. While you provide a lot of information, I don’t come away with a strong sense of how they or their philosophies fit into the larger movement – or your argument.

41. Recommend being more careful about how and when you appear in the manuscript. For example, sharing that you’re the same age as Yeah Man doesn’t add anything to the anecdote you go onto share. If the goal is to highlight that he is younger than Brother Au and Simon Chau, say that instead.

40. Is this why they gave him the land though?  
  
43. But who is Yat-Ming?  
  
General comments: I struggled to identify the throughline/main takeaway of this chapter, especially when you moved away from focusing on individuals around pg 46.  
  
**Chapter 3**

54. As a reader, becoming a bit overwhelmed by the number of people and organizations introduced.

57. Keep an eye out for where you repeat info.  
  
66. Incomplete sentence

General comments: You share a lot of interesting information here, but I’m not sure what this discussion of self-transformation contributes to the larger arguments you laid out in the introduction.

**Chapter 4**

71. For this chapter, and the manuscript more broadly, I think you would find it more productive to focus on what your research adds to current discourse, rather than how it “fills in the gaps.” Especially since in most cases, it seems like your findings/arguments are in line with current scholarship.

76. “Unlike most brides and grooms in Hong Kong, who hired fancy limousines for their big day, Yeah Man and Ah Ngau chose the humble bus as their wedding transport.” Not clear to me whether this aligns with or defies custom.

85. “Contrary to prevalent steoreotypes suggesting that being green is an easy consumption practice (Miller 2001; Gibson et al 2014)” I would drop this part of the sentence. It comes off like a strawman argument, especially given how old the citations are. You explored much more interesting ideas throughout the chapter.

General comments: I find this your strongest chapter. You did an excellent job of drawing insights from your ethnography, rather than the other way around. While I think the overall argument needs a bit more development, its clear how all of these sections fit together.

**Chapter 5**

86. You repeat info about non-indigenous villagers a few times here.

91. I wonder if it would work better to introduce the idea of living otherwise and the relationships between Central & villages at the beginning of the chapter. Would allow you to continue centering green people, rather than framing the chapter around indigenous vs non-indigenous villagers.  
  
99. Avoid using your fieldwork as a way to situate readers in time. It does not hold the same significance for them as for you and so doesn’t really work as a temporal anchor. It also gives the impression that your argument and analysis is limited to this “small” span of time.

104. This conclusion seems rather tacked on. I think this chapter still requires more thought.

**Chapter 6**

106. More examples of environment imagery?  
  
108. Repeating example.  
  
108. I’m not sure a second anecdote qualifies as “fact”  
  
114. Might be helpful to include a few examples of Chinese food scandals for readers outside EA studies  
  
118. I feel like I’ve lost the thread here.  
  
-- recommend introducing the hierarchy of green people earlier in mss.  
  
121. “I contend that Hong Kong is at the confluence of post-materialism and post-patriotism.” This is an interesting idea, but I’m not sure how we got here.

**Conclusion**

- There is a lot going on here. Reading this, especially in conjunction with the introduction, suggests to me that you’re still thinking through what you can and/or want to say about the green living movement.