Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJARR_124380**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Significance of Research in Green Design of product: An Overview**
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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 delivers information about tools/methods that are used to measure things/products to fit with green measurements. Basically, this paper seems a note, which indirectly means that no significant research contributions. The information can be found somewhere in the internet or books, and the author compiles under the topic of 'Design for Environment'. However, the manuscript still has knowledge to convey especially in methods/tools that being used by the designer/manufacturer etc in creating/developing/innovating their products, in order to prevent them polluting the environment. I could not say that I dislike this paper, but this paper does not scientifically research and written. Yet, it still provides some basic knowledge to the readers.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**The tittle is not suitable as it does not represent the whole paper. Based on the manuscript, the title should highlight the DFE. Here is my suggestion of the title: *"Design for Environment: Approaches to Green and Sustainable Product Development"*. It effectively highlights the core focus of the manuscript, which deals with environmentally conscious design processes (Design for Environment) and the development of green, sustainable products.**	
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 is poorly written. A good abstract contains purpose of the paper, methods used, findings, and implications of the paper towards the society/ organizations/body of knowledge. However, this manuscript lacks most of these elements; purpose, methodology and implications. Additionally, there are a lot of grammar and spelling errors in it. So, rewrite the abstract based on these elements, around 100 to 150 words.**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**The subsections and structure of the manuscript is not appropriate and need to restructure. The existing structure confuses readers and hard to understand, especially for Section 3.0 and 4.0. 3.0 is a discussion about DFE and 4.0 is about research methodology. DFE should be an umbrella for green design, buat if you write this way, it misunderstood that DFE and section 4.0 (and their subtopics) are not related. Moreover, the discussion of each subsection is not comprehensive, and without citations.**	
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.	**1. This manuscript is not a scientific paper as it hardly follows the requirements of scientific paper. It seems a lecture note. 2. In Introduction, the issues are clear but need to add more based on recent cases. However, some sentences in this section are incomplete, please recheck. This section also does not mention the objective of the paper, in which, in every last paragraph of section Introduction in an journal article must clearly highlight the objective of the paper and the organization of the paper. 3. Other than Literature Review, the author writes almost without citations/ references. If there are, the references are old enough. 4. The discussion on DFE and other tools/methods under DFE are not robustly discussed. 5. The author should explain thoroughly what is DFE, the functions, how DFE being applied from the previous research, how DFE has benefitted manufacturing and environment, support with data from previous research or reliable sources. 6. What is the relationship between section 3.0 and 4.0? In the Abstract, the author mentioned that DFA is an umbrella to the tools that used to environmentally design the products. However, the manuscript does not show the relationship clearly. Does the Methodology part is under DFE? If yes, restructure the way the author arranges the points and explains well. 7. In a scientific paper, Methodology part means to explain the method you use to do that research. It includes research design, and analysis, in order to present the findings. However, this manuscript uses the word Method to present the tools/methods for DFE. In this case, change the Method word with other suitable word. It can be a short sentence, instead of single word; Method. 8. Again, there are citations cited, which means the author writes without reference.**	

Review Form 3

	Writing a good journal article must refer to many reliable and recent references. **9. Each tools/method explained under DFE should be more comprehensive, give the example specific product or industry that imply the methods, supported by data from previous research.** **10. In conclusion, there author use I. It is prohibited in the journal article. Revise the sentence without using I. In conclusion should insert the implications of the research and recommendations for future research.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	**Surely the reference is insufficient and old. Cite recent journal article, 5 years back, except for literature review, the author can have older references, depend on the context. The available references also do not follow correct referencing format. Please refer to the journal guideline for referencing.**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	**Lots of errors; sentences, grammar, spelling. Please proofread the paper thoroughly.**	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript does not achieve the scientific paper level.	

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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Nur Fadiah Mohd Zawawi**
Department, University & Country	**Universiti Malaysia Kelantan, Malaysia**