

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_87671
Title of the Manuscript:	Managers' Perception on Adaptation of Green Building Practices and Environmental Performance
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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	<p>The paper investigates an interesting area that is worthy for publications. The author(s) through their study have made attempts to investigate green building practices acceptance on environmental performance and how the perception of managers support the results. While the reviewer acknowledge the author(s) efforts, based on the following observations the reviewer feel that it is not suitable for publication in current version. The authors are suggested to make corrections and resubmit the revision for review.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The study has overly relied on the work of <i>Gholami et al., (2013)</i>, (2) It is suggested the author (s) revise the sections highlighted red in the introduction section. This is because they are not statements of fact. There are a lot of studies in Sri Lanka and other developing country contexts such as Nguyen et al 2020, Durdeyve et al 2021, Darko et al 2017-202, Chan et al 2017-2020, etc. (3) Figure 1 is an important component of the study and thus some explanation is needed to make it clear. The author (s) has failed to do so and only refers to it. It is suggested you spend some time to explain it clearly. (4) At the Methodology section 3.2, the first paragraph as highlighted red needs to be reconstructed. Again having adopted the questionnaire for a study that was done in 2013, what measures did the author (s) take to ensure the relevance, reliability and credibility of the questionnaire instrument? The author (s) need to revise the questionnaire constructs to reflect the current circumstances and conduct pre-tests among others. These have not been explained in the section. (5) The information about frequencies in Table 1 is at variance with the information in the last paragraph of the methodology section highlighted red. It is stated that, 103 questionnaires were received with 86 being responsive. However, the author (s) goes ahead to use a frequency of 100. This is problematic as it bears heavily on the results. The credibility of your results with such a discrepancy is low. I suggest you re-visit this section of the study. (6) Reference to the results and discussion section of the paper, the author(s) fails to support the discussion with any literature hence comparison and markup to other findings – similar or divergent is absent. This is very important for any study and such an omission seriously affects the quality of the paper. (7) What are the implications of the study and what does it contribute to the body of knowledge? (8) Some references cited in-text are not provided in the reference list (e.g. UNEP 2019 & UNEP 2020). This should be checked. 	<p>(1) And (2) scholarly discussion of Chan et al (2017), Tran et al (2020), and Darko et al (2017) added to the article.</p> <p>(3) Explanation given</p> <p>(4) the questionnaire used for this study is not the same questionnaire used by Gholami et al., (2013). It was adopted questionnaire considering socio-economic background of the country. Authors revised para and explained the scenario</p> <p>(5) frequency given in percentage. Table raw heading has been corrected and revised as Percentage. The actual number of received questions was 103 and out of that only 86 is usable as balance (17 Nos) was partly filed by the interviewers.</p> <p>(6) Revised revision done and literature backed finding given</p> <p>(7) Contribution to body of knowledge given</p> <p>(8) This was typo error. Which has been corrected</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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