

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_129783
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring Knowledge, Attitudes, and Behaviours of Healthcare Professionals and Students Towards Resilient, Sustainable, and Green Healthcare Systems: A Scoping Review
Type of the Article	Review 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>

Review Form 3

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>
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.	My master's thesis was about the design of hospital gardens. The hospital experience starts in the hospital garden before entering the hospital. Therefore, it should appeal to all users such as staff, patients, relatives, visitors, students, pregnant women, etc. Having studies on hospital gardens in scientific studies is especially important in terms of avoiding mistakes that need to be examined in the design of these areas. The subject of the study is important and should be clearly stated and emphasized in this article. This study is considered a scope scan. I think it is necessary to develop it to detail it and increase the examples.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is long. Titles of more than 10-12 words are considered long. It may be recommended to have a title that contains a clearer and clearer purpose. <i>*Knowledge, Attitudes, and Behaviours Toward Sustainable Healthcare Systems: A Scoping Review</i>	
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.	The abstract covers the main points of the article, but some sentences could be made more concise. For example, in the section starting with 'Despite growing awareness...' the phrases should be shortened and presented to the reader in a clearer and more understandable English.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the article provides a solid analysis based on the existing literature. However, some conclusions (e.g. proposed solutions for behaviour change) could be supported by more data or examples.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally up-to-date and comprehensive. However, examples from studies in different regions/countries could be added to provide a wider geographical diversity. A detailed literature review on this subject would make the study more qualitative.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is readable for non-native speakers. Although the language level is in line with academic standards, some sentences are too long and complex. Simpler language could be used, especially in the "Barriers and Challenges" and "Opportunities" sections.	
Optional/General comments	The 'Introduction' section is quite comprehensive, but some points under the heading 'Relevance of This Study' are repetitive. In addition, please strengthen the 'Limitations' section and add more specific limitations. Also, the tables are too long and difficult to read. Please visualise the table horizontally. Write what the columns at the top mean on each page. According to the rules of the journal and according to the ethical rules I know, I have not found any ethical issues. The article presents a comprehensive and up-to-date literature review, but could use more fluent English in some places. In addition, the table/layout of the article (especially tables) makes it difficult to read. Narrative and methodological details need to be supported. I would like to check again if possible after minor corrections.	

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Atakan Pirlı
Department, University & Country	Ege University, Turkiye