

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_103148
Title of the Manuscript:	INFLUENCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS AND TRAINING OF ADULT FACILITATORS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMME IN ENUGU STATE
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The importance of the article is significant when it comes to issues related to environmental education, whether in adults or children. Therefore, the scientific community is enriched with studies like this one.</p> <p>Yes it is appropriate to the content and study undertaken by the author.</p> <p>The abstract would summarize the coherence of the title with the body of the article. However, in relation to the key words used, it should not use words that are already in the title of the article so as not to create redundancy in the information in case of searches in academic databases.</p> <p>Yes, but it could have been explored further both in the literature review and in the presentation of the results.</p> <p>The study carried out complies with the rules for the submission of articles by the journal. It presents scientific relevance, although this could be increased with more bibliographical sources, which could be more recent and relevant to the study in question. The justification for the research is reasonably explicit. The study methodology was well applied and presents interesting although scarce results. The results could have been further explored to draw better conclusions. The entire article is written in accordance with the standards prescribed in the journal of submission.</p> <p>I think the literature review could have been further explored by using more sources, more recent and more robust references to give more weight to the study undertaken.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Although I realise that the bibliographical references could be more recent and more robust I accept the article as it is without substantial changes.	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maria José da Silva Faria
Department, University & Country	School of Economics and Business Studies, Lusíada University, Maia University, Portugal