Book Name:	Mathematics and Computer Science: Research Updates
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BPR_4119**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A study on implementing Green IT in Enterprise 2.0**
Type of the Article	**Book chapter**

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is valuable to the scientific community because it explores the integration of Green IT principles within Enterprise 2.0, combining the efficiency of Web 2.0 technologies with environmentally sustainable practices. It provides insights into how collaborative tools like wikis, blogs, and social networking can enhance organizational productivity while minimizing environmental impact through reduced energy use and waste.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	The current title, **"A Study on Implementing Green IT in Enterprise 2.0,"** is clear and conveys the focus on Green IT and Enterprise 2.0. However, it could be more engaging and descriptive to highlight the study's dual emphasis on sustainability and technological integration. "Sustainable Innovation: Implementing Green IT in the Era of Enterprise 2.0". These alternatives better capture the study's emphasis on sustainability, technological advancements, and practical implications for organizations.	
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 provides a generalized overview but can be improved for clarity and comprehensiveness. While it highlights the integration of Green IT principles with Web 2.0 technologies in Enterprise 2.0, it lacks explicit mention of the study's main contributions and findings. Adding details about the specific Green IT strategies and tools discussed, as well as their practical impact on sustainability and business efficiency, would make it more compelling. Additionally, emphasizing the broader relevance of the research for organizations and the scientific community can strengthen its appeal. A more detailed yet concise summary of the study's objectives, methods, and key insights would enhance the abstract's overall effectiveness. Speling need to correct "Linkedin to LinkedIn".	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically correct in its exploration of Green IT principles within the context of Enterprise 2.0, providing clear definitions and aligning with existing literature. However, to ensure scientific rigor, it should explicitly detail its methodology, such as whether the findings are based on primary research, case studies, or literature review. Claims, particularly those involving quantitative data like CO_2 emission reductions, need to be consistently supported by credible references. While the discussion on tools and benefits is thorough, a deeper analysis of the challenges and implementation strategies for Green IT would enhance its contribution. Overall, the manuscript is conceptually sound but could benefit from additional evidence, precise language, and practical examples to strengthen its scientific validity.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references provided in the manuscript cover foundational works on Green IT and Enterprise 2.0, such as contributions by San Murugesan and Andrew McAfee, but they are limited in number and largely outdated, with many predating 2010. To ensure the manuscript reflects current advancements, it would benefit from more recent studies, particularly those from the past five years, focusing on innovations like cloud computing, AI-driven energy optimization, and the environmental impacts of collaborative tools such as Slack or Microsoft Teams. Additionally, including reports from organizations like the International Energy Agency (IEA) or the World Economic Forum could provide contemporary insights into the sustainability challenges and opportunities in digital transformation. Updating and expanding the references would strengthen the manuscript's relevance and comprehensiveness.	

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the article is generally clear and understandable; however, it requires some refinement to meet the standards of scholarly communication. Some sentences are overly verbose, and the phrasing can be simplified for clarity and precision. Additionally, the tone should be formalized to align with academic writing, avoiding conversational expressions and ensuring consistent use of technical terminology such as "Green IT" and "Web 2.0." Minor grammatical errors and inconsistencies in sentence flow also need attention. Revising the language for clarity, precision, and a scholarly tone, along with professional proofreading, would enhance the article's overall quality and suitability for academic publication.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript addresses an important and timely topic, exploring the integration of Green IT principles within Enterprise 2.0 and its potential to foster sustainability through Web 2.0 technologies. The focus is relevant and valuable for both academia and industry, particularly given the growing emphasis on environmentally sustainable practices in digital transformation. However, the paper would benefit from improvements in several areas, including language refinement, expanded and updated references, and greater clarity in presenting its methodology and findings. Acceptance of the manuscript could be considered if the authors address these concerns through revisions that improve the depth, rigor, and scholarly quality of the paper. Without these revisions, the manuscript might fall short of meeting the standards required for academic publication. Therefore, a **major revision** is recommended to strengthen the paper before reconsideration for acceptance.	

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:	**Saumendu Roy**
Department, University & Country	**University of Saskatchewan, Canada**