

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_128448
Title of the Manuscript:	Technological Innovations Driving Environmental Accounting: A Sustainable Approach A Corporate Responsibility
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: 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>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	<b>This manuscript examines</b> the role of emerging technologies such as AI, big data, and blockchain, in environmental accounting, offering timely insights into a growing field. It explores the intersection of corporate sustainability, environmental accountability, and technological innovation, providing both theoretical and practical guidance for organizations seeking responsible practices.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<u>Title</u> is good but, it could be revised for greater impact. <b>Suggested Title:</b> The Role of Emerging Technologies in Environmental Accounting: Bridging Innovation and Corporate Responsibility	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p><b>Abstract Evaluation</b></p> <p><b>The abstract covers the paper’s objectives but lacks comprehensiveness and structured organization.</b></p> <p>The abstract lacks clarity and does not adhere to the structured format typically required in scientific writing. Specifically:</p> <p><b>Introduction and Purpose:</b> The abstract does not provide a clear and engaging introduction to the topic or context, failing to capture the reader's interest and adequately convey the importance of the study.</p> <p><b>Methods and Results:</b> Key details regarding the methods used and the main findings are absent, making it difficult for readers to understand the research's approach or value.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> A proper conclusion that synthesizes the findings and highlights their significance is missing.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Rewrite the abstract in a structured format, ensuring it includes the following sections:</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> Briefly introduce the topic and its relevance.  <b>Purpose:</b> Clearly state the study's objective.  <b>Methods:</b> Summarize the methodology employed in the research.  <b>Results:</b> Highlight the most significant findings.  <b>Conclusion:</b> Provide a succinct interpretation of the results and their implications.</p>	
<p><b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b></p>	<p><b>The manuscript is scientifically robust. However:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Certain references (e.g., Scott, 2014) show inconsistencies in their publication details.</li> <li>• Some statements rely on older sources; consider integrating more recent literature to enhance the manuscript’s relevance.</li> </ul> <p><b>But, I described in reference section.</b></p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p><b>1. Reference Section Feedback</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The references in the manuscript are incomplete as they do not include the corresponding URLs or DOIs (Digital Object Identifiers) for the cited articles, which is a crucial requirement of APA 7th edition citation guidelines.</li> <li>• In APA 7th edition: DOIs should be included for all sources, formatted as a URL (e.g., <a href="https://doi.org/...">https://doi.org/...</a>). If a DOI is unavailable, provide the direct URL to the publisher's page or source location.</li> <li>• This ensures that readers can easily access the sources and enhances the credibility and traceability of the manuscript.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Review the reference list and update each citation to include the appropriate DOI or URL wherever applicable. This will align the manuscript with APA 7th edition standards and improve its overall scholarly rigor.</p> <p><b>2. Reference Section Feedback</b></p> <p>Several of the cited articles are outdated, which may limit the relevance and applicability of the manuscript's findings. Additionally, there are inconsistencies in the publication dates of certain references compared to the information available on Google Scholar.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p>Consider replacing older references with more recent and relevant studies to strengthen the manuscript’s scholarly foundation. Verify the accuracy of all publication dates and other bibliographic details to ensure consistency and adherence to academic standards.</p> <p><b>Reference Accuracy Feedback</b></p> <p><b>An example</b> of inconsistency in the reference list is the citation for the following source:</p> <p>Scott, W. R. (2014). Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities (4th ed.). Sage Publications.  <a href="https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=2451254">https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=2451254</a></p> <p>However, according to alternative sources, such as the original book's publisher and Google Scholar, the publication date differs:</p>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>Amazon Listing: Scott, W. R. (2013). Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities. Sage Publications.  <a href="https://www.amazon.co.uk/Institutions-Organizations-W-Richard-Scott/dp/1452242224">https://www.amazon.co.uk/Institutions-Organizations-W-Richard-Scott/dp/1452242224</a></p> <p><a href="https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&amp;as_sdt=0%2C5&amp;q=Scott%2C+W.+R.+%282014%29.+Institutions+and+Organizations%3A+Ideas%2C+Interests%2C+and+Identities+%284th+ed.%29.+Sage+Publications.&amp;btnG=">https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&amp;as_sdt=0%2C5&amp;q=Scott%2C+W.+R.+%282014%29.+Institutions+and+Organizations%3A+Ideas%2C+Interests%2C+and+Identities+%284th+ed.%29.+Sage+Publications.&amp;btnG=</a></p> <p>Google Scholar: Also cites the publication year as 2013.</p> <p>This discrepancy creates a historical conflict in the reference list and underscores the need for accurate bibliographic details.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p>Verify the correct publication year and details by consulting the primary source (the original book or publisher's website).          Update the citation accordingly, ensuring consistency across the manuscript and its references.          Include valid links (e.g., DOI, publisher URL, or authoritative library catalog links) to provide clear access to the source.          This adjustment will resolve the conflicting information and enhance the manuscript's credibility.</p>	
<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>The manuscript is</b> written in a scholarly tone; however, certain sections could be refined for improved clarity and readability.</p> <p><b>Summarization:</b> Since the manuscript is articulated and elaborated well, the content might benefit from a more concise presentation. Focus on the key points and avoid over-explaining, while maintaining the scholarly tone. Aim to deliver clear, direct insights without excessive elaboration.</p> <p><b>Shortening</b> long sentences for better flow.</p> <p><b>Avoiding redundancy</b> in descriptions of technological tools.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Keywords Feedback</b></p> <p>The keywords section requires revision to improve clarity, relevance, and alignment with the article's content. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Alphabetical Order:</b> Keywords should be arranged in alphabetical order to maintain consistency with academic standards.</li> <li>• <b>Clarity and Relevance:</b> Replace or refine the keywords with clearer terms that better encapsulate the core themes and topics discussed in the manuscript.</li> <li>• <b>Quantity:</b> It is recommended to limit the keywords to 3 to 6 terms, which is sufficient for effectively summarizing the content and improving discoverability.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Carefully review and update the keywords to ensure they accurately reflect the article's focus areas while adhering to academic conventions.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Mohammad Amiri</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Panjab University, India</b></p>