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

Monica Mensah Danquah[1]

1 University of Ghana

The paper reads well and shows originality and innovation in the state-of-the-art review that systematically investigates the contributions of academic libraries to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by comparing SDG design and programming across different regions and contexts. It uses a Global Indicator Framework (GIF) to map library activities, actions, culture, leadership, partnerships, and key performance indicators to the specific SDGs, targets, and indicators that they address or impact. It identifies the interconnections and dependencies among the SDGs, targets, and indicators, as well as the factors that influence the attainment of sustainability literacy in academic libraries. Indeed, this paper reveals the gaps and challenges in the existing literature on library contributions to the SDGs, such as the lack of focus, evidence, comparison, and holistic understanding of sustainability literacy and the SDGs. However, there are a few observations and suggestions that could help improve the paper. These are as follows:

- **Lack of clarity on the research question and objectives:** The paper does not clearly state the main research question and the specific objectives that guide the thematic synthesis. It would be helpful to articulate these elements in the introduction section and use them to structure the discussion and conclusion sections.
- **Lack of justification for the selection of databases and search terms:** The paper does not explain why Scopus, Web of Science, and EBSCO LISTA were chosen as the databases for the literature search, and how the search terms were derived and refined. It would be useful to provide more details on the search strategy and the rationale behind it, as well as the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the articles.
- **Lack of critical appraisal of the quality and relevance of the included articles:** The paper does not report how the quality and relevance of the included articles were assessed and how they influenced the synthesis. It would be important to apply a critical appraisal tool or framework to evaluate the strengths and limitations of the articles and their implications for the findings and recommendations of the synthesis.
- **Lack of discussion on the limitations and implications of the synthesis:** The paper does not acknowledge the limitations of the synthesis, such as the potential publication bias, the heterogeneity of the articles, the subjectivity of the coding and analysis, and the generalizability of the results. It would be necessary to discuss these limitations and their impact on the validity and reliability of the synthesis, as well as the implications for future research and practice.