Science, which inevitably underlies environmental disputes, poses significant challenges for the scientifically untrained judges who decide such cases. In addition to disrupting ordinary fact-finding and causal inquiry, science can influence the framing of disputes and the standard of review. Judges must adopt various tools to adjust the level of science allowed to enter their deliberations, which in turn may have a profound impact on the legitimacy of their reasoning. While neglecting or replacing scientific authority can render judicial reasoning less convincing, the same authority, when treated properly, may lend persuasive force to adjudicatory findings and buttress the legitimacy of judgments.

In her recent book *Science and Judicial Reasoning: The Legitimacy of International Environmental Adjudication* (Cambridge University Press 2020), Katalin Sulyok has surveyed the environmental case law of seven major jurisdictions and has analyzed framing techniques, evidentiary procedures, causal inquiries and standards of review. In the first of our Bocconi Conversations in International Law, she will offer and discuss her insights into how judges justify their choices between rival scientific claims in a convincing and legitimate manner.