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| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | 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.** | **The subject discussed in this book is something very important. Environmental damage is no longer an external issue—it directly affects the economy, supply chains, and financial systems. This manuscript brings much-needed attention to this matter. I appreciate how this book not only reiterates existing frameworks but also explains why, not just how. That makes it valuable for readers such as students, policy analysts, or even private sector professionals. In short, this is a very timely work for discussing important matters that are still overlooked by many accounting texts.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title works well. It's informative and to the point. I believe it captures the scope and intent of the manuscript with clarity. No need to change anything here.** |  |
| 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. | **As far as I could see, there isn't an abstract at the front of the manuscript. I'd recommend adding one. It doesn’t need to be long, maybe half a page but enough to tell the reader what this book sets out to do and why it matters. Think of it like a map before a journey. It helps.** |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  | **The author did a solid job here. It is clear that the arguments are based on legitimate environmental accounting standards. References to SEEA, GRI, ESG, and other relevant frameworks indicate that the authors know what they are talking about. The provided data examples are current, and I did not find any part that raises questions in terms of technical reliability.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | **I think the references are generally strong.** |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | **The writing reads smoothly and is appropriate for a scholarly context. Explanations are clear, and the phrasing feels natural, without being overly technical or dense. The ideas come across without ambiguity, and the overall structure makes the content easy to follow. I didn’t come across any parts that would require major rewriting, and the tone is consistent from start to finish.** |  |
| Optional/General comments | **This is a thoughtful and relevant book. It’s structured well, moves logically, and doesn’t get lost in theory. The use of country case studies gives it weight. Once the author adds a short abstract and updates a few references, I think this manuscript will be in great shape.** |  |
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| **PART 2:**  |
|  | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s comment *(if agreed with the 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?**  |  |  |
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