

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_89660
Title of the Manuscript:	Mediating Role of Green Reward on Green Training and Environmental Performance in Nigerian Food and Beverages
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript can be considered for publication if the author(s) revise the paper again and improve the manuscript accordingly.</p> <p>Presentation: good</p> <p>Abstract: Need to improve the text. Some points are not clear. Sentence structure is not so good. Use few statistical values to justify the text.</p> <p>Introduction: Okay (need improvement). Use references (where truly necessary)</p> <p>Materials and Methods: Okay. Need few elaborations.</p> <p>Results: Quite good. Some changes required. Presentation of key findings using some graphs and figures is highly instructed. Better to use few graphs.</p> <p>Discussion: Need improvement.</p> <p>Conclusion: Recheck this part precisely. Need to change. Do not repeat the sentences.</p> <p>References: All the references must be arranged consecutively/serially in the text for better understanding and recheck according to the journal's guidelines. Some references do not cited properly. Author(s) have to check the references again.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few sentence structure and representation is not well-written. Author(s) should check the English language, typographical, grammatical errors etc. very carefully • Research idea: good • Data analysis: good. Mention the statistical value (<i>p-value</i>) properly. <p>In some cases, need justification.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several grammatical mistakes • Revise and improve the manuscript following reviewer's comments before final submission • Major revisions required • Better to concise the manuscript • Need clarification in some points. Need explanation in discussion section. • Reviewer encourages the author(s) to check each and every reference precisely, and arrange it perfectly according to the Journal's format for better representation. <p>Do not repeat same idea, aspect, and sentence in different paragraphs. Better to represent differently. Statistical values should mention perfectly.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shourav Dutta
Department, University & Country	Rangamati Science and Technology University, Bangladesh