

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_83531
Title of the Manuscript:	Overview of the opportunities and challenges towards the uptake of Sustainability practices among manufacturing firms in Uganda.
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The underlying idea is good but it seems to me that this manuscript should undergo some formal improvements, including as follows:</p> <p>1.- careful proofreading and editing: for instance, see the blank missing between "Table" and "1" (page 2), the ";" symbol before "see" (page 19) and the word "are" after a singular subject ("the implementation of sustainability initiative", page 19 again); see also paragraph 4.2.3 (page 20), that is right-justified, with the left side to be rearranged, and the word "According" capitalized just before note 99 (page 20 again);</p> <p>2.- a revision of the English language used to forge the text: "as such" is used too often; in many cases the subject is implied (rather than specified) and hence several sentences tend to be generated in a way that is not so coherent with the English style; special attention should be paid to the abstract and the "Conclusion" paragraph, where verbs are used inconsistently at present/past mode;</p> <p>3.- a better combination of text and figures: for instance, Table 1 should not be split between two pages;</p> <p>4.- a review of keywords: "comprehensive review" does not sound appropriate since it does not seem useful to electronically retrieve the paper; therefore, I suggest to replace it. The same applies to "opportunities" and "barriers". Furthermore, if some keywords are capitalized, all of them should be, otherwise, the author(s) could decide not to capitalize any of them.</p> <p>In addition, I think that the reference list should be double-checked: not only the format/style is not homogeneous (for instance, see how respective DOIs are reported differently for the various items in the list), but in more than one case (see items 14 and 99) it seems that the citation has been copied and pasted from another reference list (since they are listed as "2020b" and "2019b" respectively); apparently, the family name of an author is missing in item 50, which also has some words underlined (while they should not); the font size seems smaller in item 51 where the year is in bold type as an exception to the rule otherwise applied; there are unnecessary blanks at the beginning of line 2 of item 86.</p> <p>I would also suggest to shorten the title, to make it more effective, for instance: "Sustainability practices among manufacturing firms in Uganda: An Overview of Challenges and Opportunities". If the title is left unchanged, the author(s) should decide whether to use a small "s" as the initial letter of the word sustainability or to capitalize all other initial letters.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Margherita Mori
Department, University & Country	University of L'Aquila, Italy