

# Review of: "Are Academic Libraries Doing Enough to Support the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)? A State-of-the-Art Review"

Lúcia Barão<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidade de Lisboa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript is very interesting and well written. The main strong points are the goals, clarity in the objectives and methods presented. However, there are also some weak points, such as the length of the article (it is too long and sometimes repetitive), the tables and figures are too numerous, the Results section is very confusing and not entirely supported/linked to the methods. I also think that the manuscript would benefit from restructuration (there are too many sub-sections within each section) and a Results and Discussion section together. Below, I've listed some comments/suggestions:

## Abstract

"The aim of this study was to assess the role that academic libraries play in realizing Sustainable Development Goals" -> What do the authors mean by "realizing"?

"A majority of these papers represent institutions located in Asia (26.32%), Africa (21.05%), International (15.79%), Europe (10.53%), North America (5.26%), and Oceania (5.26%)." -> Unclear when reading the abstract what "international" means. Also, it should come in the beginning or the end...

"Targets 4:4, 16:10, 4:7, and 12:8 demonstrated closely interlinked relationships" -> Briefly mention the targets' names... Otherwise, it is difficult to follow for readers.

## Introduction

Very well written, but it is too long. Also, figures and tables in the Introduction should really be carefully thought out before being included. Only when really necessary, they should be included.

"Libraries can also support SDG 13 (Climate Action) by providing access to information and encouraging sustainable practices in communities." How can libraries encourage practices? It needs a reference.

"Aims of the study" -> This should be removed.

## Materials and Methods

"State of the art review" -> Please remove this paragraph, since it is not necessary.

Table 2 (a, b, c) and the paragraphs “Selection of articles” should be in the Results section...

“Inclusion criteria, exclusion criteria” -> Reorganize in one section. Too many sub-sections in the following text.

## Results

“This article consists of 25 papers, with data from academic libraries. Many academic libraries were located in Asia (26.32%), Africa (21.05%), North America (5.26%), Europe (10.53%), Oceania (5.26%), and International (15.79%, a paper including data from Australia, America” -> Please rephrase this sentence. It is not well written and also uses unspecific words (many) to refer to objective quantification.

Figure 4 -> It is unclear how this is a result. Was this taken from the 25 papers analysed? How?

Figure 5 is not properly included in the Results. There is no explanation or interpretation of the Results shown.

Figure 6 -> The SGD should be listed in order.

“The most commonly reported targets in the papers are (a.) 1.2, (b.) 3.3, (c.) 3.7, (d.) 4.7, 5.5, (e.) 6.5, (d.) 7.3, (f.) 16.10, (g.) 17.9, (h.) 17.16, and (i.) 17.17.” The names of the targets should be present to facilitate interpretation.

“The rule of mapping in Fig. 8” -> There is no Figure 8.

“The rule of mapping in Fig. 8 is that the larger the line connecting an item or a set of items, the stronger the association.” This should be in the figure caption and not in the text.

Table 5 -> This could be removed and just mentioned in the text.

“Sustainability awareness among academic librarians” and the following sub-sections -> How was this analysis conducted? On the same 25 papers? Did you choose only a few of them to analyse?

Table 6 -> The same comment applies: Are these papers the ones selected in the study? This is not clear.