

Paper: “The Carbon Footprint as a Key Indicator for Environmental Management Controllers: Towards Environmental Performance – A Literature Review”

Submitted: 07 December 2024

Accepted: 07 February 2025

Published: 28 February 2025

Corresponding Author: Bouchouit Kaoutar

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2025.v21n4p109](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2025.v21n4p109)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Philippes Mbevo Fendoung
University oh Douala, Cameroon

Reviewer 2: Hamzokhan Tagar
College Education Department Government of Sindh, Pakistan

Reviewer 3: Sosthenes Kufogbe
Wisconsin International University College (WIUC), Ghana

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is correct, but needs to be reworded to reflect the content of the article. I'd suggest this:

"The Carbon Footprint as a Crucial Metric for Environmental Management:
Advancing Towards Enhanced Environmental Performance – A Literature Review"

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract missed the crucial elements of the results

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The article requires thorough proofreading to improve the language style.

My level of English does not allow me to clearly identify these errors.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

This section is completely absent, which is unacceptable. The authors must have thought that a literature review article does not have a section on methodology. This was a mistake.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the text is clear but lacks organisation. The literature review is very basic. The literature review cannot be reduced to a simple expression of the title of the work followed by an evasive literature on its content.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is too long. It should focus on summarising the key elements, i.e. the main insights of the review. But also the importance and impact of the reflections on the relevance of the subject in the current context.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is complete, except that it seems too old. The authors would benefit from updating it with recent publications.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I suggest a new plan for your article. This would make it easier to understand your literature review efforts.

Here is a possible structure for your literature review article:

1. Introduction

General context: Presentation of the subject and its contextual framework.

Problem: Identification of the issues and key questions that motivated the authors to write a literature review article on the theme of carbon footprint.

Objectives of the literature review: Clarification of the research goals and hypotheses.

2. Methodology

Selection criteria for articles, books, reports, etc.: Details on the inclusion and exclusion criteria for studies.

Search strategy: Description of the databases and keywords used.

Data analysis: Methods of analysis and interpretation of the selected studies. For each article, its general idea, the methodological approach, the results obtained must be included.

3. Contextualization of studies

Research history: Evolution of studies on the subject over time. Authors can define a time step for the article.

Emerging themes: Identification of the main themes or sub-themes of the literature review.

4. Results

Synthesis of findings: Summary of the key results of the studies reviewed. The various summaries of the scientific documents consulted will feed this part.

Comparison of results: Analysis of congruences and divergences between studies.

5. Discussion

Interpretation of results: Critical analysis of the implications of the findings.
Contribution to the literature: How these results enrich the field of study on the carbon footprint.
Limitations of existing studies: Identification of weaknesses and potential biases.

6. Research perspectives

Gaps identified: Discussion of areas requiring further research.
Suggestions for future studies: Recommendations to guide future research.

7. Conclusion

Summary of key elements: Synthesis of the main insights of the review.
Importance and impact: Reflection on the relevance of the subject in the current context.

8. References

Bibliography: Exhaustive list of sources cited, formatted according to current standards.

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Adequately clear

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Yes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The first sentence of introduction is incomplete. Please correctly rewrite it.

Figures should be more legible.

The literature could be extended with up-to-date studies like below:

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-023-30946-2>

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15567249.2022.2046210>

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-021-01444-7>

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

It's clear and perfect matching with review ideas

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is also fine

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

it's good in writing

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The author adopted descriptive method and acceptable

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is appropriate

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The paper on environment management control is the need of the hour and net addition

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

the list of references is in order

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

paper is the need of the hour and we should encourage these kinds of paper for better understanding on the future challenges

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The Title is clear

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Abstract is concise and comprehensive

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Yes, these are highlighted in the main paper

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Explanation of the methods is Satisfactory

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Suggestions are provided in the report for merging some short and related paragraphs

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Satisfactory.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The Reference list is comprehensive

Eco-control as the subject matter of the article has evolved very rapidly as would be seen from the existing Digital Reference Databases such as Google Scholar, Research Gate. This is an excellent paper which should capture this by adding some more current References

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Minor errors have been identified and needs correction.
