

# Review of: "Participatory budgeting for public involvement in environmental sustainability at a Thai university"

Anat Abramovich

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The main idea behind this manuscript is interesting and might be innovative in a way (depends on the expanded introduction). Still, what's written here fits more as a 'position paper' or a pre-research sketch. Whether the author would like to continue with this manuscript I have some suggestions:

- Introduction: To elaborate about participatory democracy
- Sustainable projects in higher education: "While laudable, there is some evidence that projects to make campuses more environmentally friendly encounter resistance especially if the projects are imposed in a top-down fashion by the administrators or by external organizations" Please add examples from universities that already had implemented EfS among their members.
- Sustainable projects in higher education: "There is also the potential for a disjunct between implementing a campus project and raising awareness with little integration between the two goals." Verify why and in what way.
- Research questions: to rephrase question no. 1.
- The context: "The case study described in this paper took place at a well-respected Thai technological university. Rated on Hofstede's (2011) six dimensions of culture, Thailand is notable for exhibiting very high power difference (Buriyameathagul, 2013)" Needs to be explained more.
- The context: "As a consequence, much decision making in Thailand is top-down, and this also applies in education where authorities generally exert strong control and often make policy decisions with little or no input from the public (Watson Todd & Darasawang, 2021). It is therefore rare for students and junior staff members at Thai universities to have a say in the university's policies and projects." To consider if this paragraph fits here.
- The context: To divide between participants and the research environment. Since the research focuses on the voters, maybe the author should describe them.
- The context: To consider moving the first two tables to the appendix.
- Results and Discussion: The result section must be presented in a different way. For example, to examine whether there were connections between decision making and feeling. Another thing to discuss is the word environment, that was mentioned only by 14 voters that voted for environmental projects.
- PB instruction should be organized differently. A brief explanation in the research tools section and all the details in the appendix.
- I suggest you look at your raw results again and try to exhibit them in a more sophisticated way. It might improve your manuscript.

I hope my comments will help improve your manuscript and wish you good luck.