

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_120825
Title of the Manuscript:	GREEN PACKAGING PRACTICES ON ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY IN GHANA'S HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW ARTICLE.
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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Assessment of environmental performance is key to the current state of affairs on planet earth. Has quoted statistical basis of other journals.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	GREEN PACKAGING PRACTICES ON ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY IN GHANA'S HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY: A SYSTEMATIC literature REVIEW ARTICLE.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes . The abstract should be a continuous prose without subheadings, and disclose the theoretical approaches adopted. The results report should be from the findings without citing others work.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes but not detailed	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Has reviewed journals. Has statistical base of argument. Has demonstrated other scholars work.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The references needs to be a bit recent	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Needs some punctuation eg tourism industry but not tourist industry, "Compliance marketing" encompasses a wide range of practices and has just lately gained prominence in the advertising industry (Baumann et al., 2002). 2002 is not late its old enough. According to research done by(Chung, Parker, 2008; Masa'deh et al., 2017), green supply chain management solutions improve operational, financial, and environmental outcomes. Ayivor and Gordon in 2012 and Appiah and colleagues in 2014 cite prior research that concludes land use change poses a significant risk to ecological sustainability (Ayivor, Gordon, 2012; Appiah et al., 2014). Should go like thisAyivor and Gordon (2012): Appiah and colleagues (<u>provide their names</u>)(2014) cited previous.....</p> <p>the question of how farming methods affect environmental sustainability is crucial. (is misplaced)</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>There is a lot of editorial issues</p> <p>The analysed results of the scholar are missing to warrant support or refusal of the findings. At some point one ends being confused whether Mensah is the scholar and composer of this script. The methodology does not clearly derive the objectives and statement of the problem is lacking</p> <p>According to Bohdanowicz and Martinac in 2003,.....According to Mensah in 2013, a lot has happened since then hence not appropriate conclusion</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joseph Karimi Ngunga
Department, University & Country	Karatina University, Kenya