



**Paper: “Towards a Sustainable Digital Future: Exploring AI, Legal Frameworks, and Environmental Transformations in the Post-COVID Era?”**

**Submitted: 08 September 2024**

**Accepted: 18 March 2025**

**Published: 31 March 2025**

Corresponding Author: Chrysoula Kapartziani

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n8p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Edna Johnny  
University of Liberia, Liberia

Reviewer 2: Priyantha W. Mudalige  
University of Kelaniya, Kelaniya, Sri Lanka

Reviewer 3: Blinded

### ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Edna G. Johnny (PhD)	
University/Country: University of Liberia	
Date Manuscript Received: Nov 25, 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: Dec 16, 2024
Manuscript Title: Towards a Green Metaverse Era. How can experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic trigger law and environmental-related transformations, as well as green data input?	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0976/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

#### Evaluation Criteria:

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The title is clear but not adequate to the content. For instance, the title of the paper is Towards a Green Metaverse Era. How can experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic trigger law and environmental-related transformations, as well as green data input? What are those specific Covid 19 experiences, what were the short coming or impact of those experiences which could trigger law and environmental related transformations?.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The abstract is not easily understandable from the topic. For instance, the beginning of the abstract states that it</b> explore the impact of digitalization. Specifically, the author focused on the intersection of software engineering, sustainability, and accountability which is a bit confusing.	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>There are few grammatical errors that needs to be corrected</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The study methods are clear, the author however needs to stake whether it was face to face interview or virtual.</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The results from the qualitative interview are clear and do not contain error</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>The conclusions are supported by the findings, it however does not support the tile of the paper</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>The paper was well referenced, comprehensive and appropriate.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**The paper is good and informative, however the tile or the content needs to be revisited so that the tile will reflect the content.**

### **ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025**

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Dr Priyantha Mudalige	
University/Country: Sri Lanka	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: 18/02/2025	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Paper for review 0976/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

#### **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Rating Result</b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Not clear enough</b>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Indeed, your abstract is inadequate. So, I'll give you some suggestions. An abstract should include the following themes. Introduction to the research, study background, problem of the research, objectives of the research, methodology of the research, limitations of the research, and findings. Finally, if possible, add policy recommendations.</b>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>There are some of grammatical issues.</b>	

<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
The research methodology is not systematic. Also, the author has not presented his views in a way that confirms the scientific basis of the research. So I would like to respectfully recommend that you present the research methods more clearly. Please use tables, graphs, diagrams, or other mathematical models. Also show your analysis information.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>In your article, you have written a story. In my opinion, you have not presented the findings of the research in a skillful manner, based on analysis.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>You have not presented the conclusion clearly with data and evidence.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>There are major flaws in the reference list. Please use APA style. This author appears to be unfamiliar with the fundamentals of compiling a reference list for a scientific essay.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Dear Author,

I offered remarks in the hope of producing a better-completed product. You do not have to

be concerned about this. I understand that you have the capability. All you must do now is

submit your article in response to these remarks. Follow these guidelines.

About your article, essential parts of its body are not highlighted and presented. For example, the research problem or research gap, research objectives, and methodology are not apparent. Also, use the primary data to confirm what you are going to explain. You can use tables, charts, diagrams, etc., for that. I hope there is enough information in your country relevant to your topic. Please use them.

The citations are not mentioned in many places in your article, which is a significant shortcoming.

I don't see your article as a research paper. It is like a note that is distributed to the students.

You are poor in that regard.

Thank You

Best,

Dr. Priyantha W. Mudalige,

Senior Lecturer,

Department of Political Science,

University of Kelaniya, Kelaniya,

Sri Lanka