

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_126965
Title of the Manuscript:	GREEN LIBRARIES: ASSESSING THE ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY INITIATIVES IN PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN GHANA
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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>

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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript fills a gap in the literature by examining environmental sustainability initiatives within public libraries in Ghana. Given the urgent need to adopt sustainable practices globally, this study provides valuable insights that can help shape policies and operational practices in similar contexts.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	There is a prompt to assess the title, but it lacks specific feedback. For example, consider if adding keywords such as "Challenges" or "Effectiveness" would better reflect the focus on evaluating the initiatives and their impact.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Consider including a brief mention of the statistical analysis used and the most significant findings, such as the challenges faced by libraries, to enhance clarity for readers."	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is structured effectively, with clear sections for introduction, methodology, and results. However, the discussion could benefit from subheadings to organize themes like 'Effectiveness of Initiatives' and 'Challenges Faced'. "Staff Participation," "Challenges to Implementation") to enhance coherence. The author should ensure smooth transitions between sections to improve readability.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The author should revisit the study's statistical methods, such as ANOVA, and justified. Mention the strengths of the chosen methodology, such as the use of a positivist paradigm and survey design, which are appropriate for quantifying perceptions and behaviors. "The manuscript's use of quantitative analysis, including statistical tests like ANOVA, adds rigor to the findings, allowing for a nuanced understanding of demographic factors that influence participation in sustainability initiatives."	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are mostly relevant, but some foundational studies on green libraries from recent years could provide additional context." "Adding more recent references (2019–2023) on sustainability in libraries would further strengthen the literature review and align the study with current trends in environmental science and information management."	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is generally appropriate, but some sections would benefit from simpler phrasing to improve readability. For example, rephrase ‘implementing resource conservation through green initiatives’ as ‘adopting green initiatives for resource conservation’.”</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author should consider future research directions, such as a comparative study between urban and rural libraries in Ghana. "This manuscript has strong potential due to its novel focus on green initiatives in Ghanaian libraries. Further exploration of urban-rural library differences could enhance future studies." Consistency: Ensure feedback is consistent in tone and thoroughness across all sections, from abstract evaluation to references. Constructive Language: Use positive and constructive language to make suggestions actionable and supportive, such as “Consider clarifying...” rather than “The language is unclear.” Follow-Up for Specific Issues: If significant issues are identified, suggest specific improvements and provide examples where appropriate.</p>	

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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Odularu Oluwayemi Ibukunoluwa</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Walter Sisulu University, South Africa</p>