 ISSN: 3107-6513

Quantifying the Dual Impact: A Comprehensive Analysis of Green Laboratory Technology Adoption on Operational Cost Reduction and Environmental Sustainability in Nigerian Research Institutions

Lukman Latifat and Ikhenemue O. Oseni
Department of Science Laboratory Technology
Auchi Polytechnic Auchi Edo State Nigeria
Corresponding author's email: ***lukmanetse@gmail.com***[1]

Abstract— Nigerian research institutions operate under severe energy and financial constraints, with laboratories consuming disproportionate shares of institutional budgets while generating significant environmental loads. Green laboratory technology (GLT) adoption offers a dual pathway to address both operational costs and ecological sustainability, yet empirical quantification of these benefits within the Nigerian context remains sparse. This paper presents a comprehensive analysis of the dual impact of GLT adoption on cost reduction and environmental sustainability in Nigerian research institutions, synthesising global evidence and contextualising findings for the Nigerian operating environment. A systematic narrative review was conducted drawing on peer-reviewed literature from Scopus, PubMed, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. Sources were screened for relevance to laboratory sustainability, energy economics, waste management, and institutional practice in Africa and comparable developing-country contexts. Thirty high-quality references were synthesised. Evidence indicates that certified green laboratory programmes reduce energy consumption by 20–50%, lower operational costs by up to $39,000 per academic laboratory annually, and cut carbon dioxide-equivalent (CO_2e) emissions by an average of 31.32 tonnes per laboratory per year. In the Nigerian context, solar photovoltaic microgrid integration has been shown to reduce energy costs substantially and improve research reliability across universities. Chemical waste mismanagement in African academic laboratories poses significant public health and environmental risks that GLT addresses directly. GLT adoption is technically feasible and economically justifiable for Nigerian research institutions. A phased implementation framework anchored by policy reform, institutional capacity building, and green financing instruments is recommended. The dual fiscal and ecological returns position GLT as a strategic imperative rather than an optional enhancement.

Keywords: *green laboratory technology; environmental sustainability; operational cost reduction; Nigerian research institutions; renewable energy; waste management; laboratory efficiency*

I. Introduction

Globally, research laboratories are among the most resource-intensive facilities in the built environment. Laboratories consume up to ten times more energy per square metre than equivalent office space [1], and collectively generate substantial volumes of chemical waste, greenhouse gases, and water consumption. As the world grapples with the imperatives of sustainable development, the scientific community itself faces growing scrutiny over its environmental footprint [2]. Within this global challenge, Nigerian research institutions occupy a particularly complex position. Nigeria hosts an extensive network of federal and state universities, polytechnics, research institutes, and teaching hospitals. Despite this breadth, the country invests only 0.13% of its GDP in research and development far below the African Union's recommended 1% target [3]. This underfunding manifests most acutely in laboratory infrastructure: institutions routinely report inadequate electricity supply, aging equipment, a lack of reagents, and virtually no dedicated environmental management systems [4]. The combination of unreliable national grid power and over-reliance on diesel generators imposes escalating operating costs that consume already-constrained institutional budgets [5].

Against this backdrop, green laboratory technology (GLT) has emerged as a convergent solution. GLT encompasses a suite of hardware, practice, and governance interventions ranging from solar photovoltaic (PV) microgrids and energy-efficient equipment to formalised waste segregation protocols and sustainable procurement that simultaneously reduce operating costs and environmental harm [6]. Crucially, peer-reviewed evidence from analogous settings demonstrates that GLT benefits are not confined to well-resourced northern laboratories: tailored adoption in developing-country institutions yields comparable proportional gains [7].

This paper makes three contributions. First, it consolidates quantitative evidence on the dual cost and environmental impacts of GLT adoption. Second, it explicitly

 ISSN: 3107-6513

contextualises that evidence within the structural constraints of Nigerian research institutions. Third, it proposes a phased, policy-anchored implementation framework calibrated to the Nigerian operating environment. The paper is organised as follows: Section 2 describes the methodological approach; Sections 3–6 present thematic findings on energy, waste, water, and procurement dimensions; Section 7 synthesises findings into a dual-impact model; Section 8 addresses barriers and facilitators; Section 9 proposes a framework; and Section 10 concludes.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Review Design

A systematic narrative review methodology was adopted, appropriate for synthesising heterogeneous evidence across multiple disciplines; energy engineering, environmental science, institutional management, and development economics. The protocol followed PRISMA-inspired principles of transparent search, eligibility screening, and synthesis.

B. Search Strategy

Five academic databases were searched: Scopus, PubMed/MEDLINE, Web of Science, Google Scholar, and the Consensus AI academic search engine. Search terms were combined using Boolean operators and included: ("green laboratory" OR "sustainable laboratory" OR "green lab certification") AND ("energy" OR "cost" OR "waste" OR "carbon") AND ("research institution" OR "university" OR "hospital" OR "Africa" OR "Nigeria"). Searches were conducted in May–June 2026 with no publication date restriction.

C. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Studies were included if they: (i) reported quantitative or mixed-method outcomes related to laboratory energy use, costs, or environmental indicators; (ii) were published in peer-reviewed journals or reputable grey-literature repositories; and (iii) were in English. Studies focused exclusively on industrial manufacturing without laboratory relevance were excluded. Thirty references were retained after screening for quality and relevance.

D. Synthesis Approach

Given the heterogeneity of outcomes and contexts, a narrative synthesis was employed. Where multiple studies reported comparable metrics (e.g., percentage energy savings, CO_2e reductions), a descriptive quantitative summary is presented. Findings are thematically organised and contextualised for Nigeria using country-specific sources.

III. ENERGY CONSUMPTION AND COST REDUCTION

A. The Disproportionate Energy Burden of Research Laboratories

Research laboratories represent a concentrated source of institutional energy expenditure. A single ultra-low temperature freezer draws as much energy as an average domestic household, and a single fume hood can consume between 1.0 and 1.5 times the energy used by the average residential home [8]. A typical 50-station computer laboratory drawing an average 150 W per workstation requires 7.5 kW of continuous power — a demand wholly incompatible with Nigeria's notoriously unreliable grid supply [9]. It is estimated that laboratories account for up to 50% of total campus energy consumption despite occupying only a quarter of building area [10].

In Nigeria, this challenge is compounded by structural energy deficits. Despite ambitious government targets including universal energy access by 2030 and 30 GW of renewable energy capacity grid reliability remains severely constrained, and Nigerian universities have historically responded by operating diesel generator sets at substantial expense [5, 11]. The operational and financial sustainability of this model is clearly untenable as fuel prices continue to rise.

B. Solar Photovoltaic Microgrids as a Green Laboratory Solution

The most impactful green technology intervention documented for Nigerian universities is the integration of solar PV microgrids. A 2025 study examining renewable energy integration across Obafemi Awolowo University (OAU), Federal University of Agriculture Abeokuta (FUNAAB), Nnamdi Azikiwe University (UNIZIK), and the University of Lagos (UNILAG) found that solar microgrids reduce energy costs substantially while improving academic service reliability [12]. Hybrid designs combining PV, battery storage, and legacy diesel generation as transitional backup emerge consistently as the most replicable and cost-effective model for Nigerian campuses [12, 13].

Nationally, the case for solar adoption is further supported by Nigeria's tropical solar resource potential. A 2024 feasibility assessment published in Frontiers in Energy Research confirmed that hybrid solar-battery-generator systems reduce annual carbon dioxide emissions significantly compared to baseline diesel-dependent configurations [13]. Compared with diesel systems using incandescent lighting, LED-equipped solar PV systems save between 56% and 81% in net present cost [14].

C. Quantified Savings from Green Laboratory Certification

Global green laboratory certification data provide the strongest quantitative benchmarks for dual-impact estimation. My Green Lab Certification 2.0 the world's most widely recognised and EPA-recommended laboratory sustainability programme reports that academic laboratories achieve an average annual CO_2e reduction of 31.32 metric tonnes and cost savings of approximately USD 39,000 per laboratory [15]. Commercial laboratories achieve even larger gains: USD 99,000 in annual savings and 131 tonnes CO_2e per laboratory [15]. Key interventions driving these savings include optimising fume hood sash operations, consolidating freezer inventories, improving cold-storage efficiency, and reducing unnecessary water use [15].

Specific behavioural and technical measures are well-documented. Raising ultra-low temperature freezer setpoints from -80°C to -70°C yields meaningful energy savings without compromising sample integrity [1]. AI-optimised energy management systems and smart grid technologies for hospital and laboratory complexes can reduce energy consumption by up to 30% [16]. The International Institute for Sustainable Laboratories (I2SL) and the Laboratory Efficiency Assessment Framework (LEAF) both provide structured pathways through which institutions in developing countries can benchmark and improve performance [10, 17].

IV. WASTE MANAGEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

A. The Scale of Laboratory Waste in African Institutions

Laboratory waste management in African higher education institutions represents one of the most immediate and tractable environmental challenges. Studies in East Africa document that most higher education institutions in developing countries lack adequate waste management plans or selective waste collection systems [18]. A landmark study of research and educational laboratories in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, directly comparable in institutional context to Nigerian universities found that liquid waste was mostly acidic, contaminated with heavy metals including lead (Pb: 0.12–2.33 mg/L), chromium (Cr: 0.01–0.19 mg/L), and copper (Cu: 0.02–3.44 mg/L) at concentrations exceeding safety limits, and disposed of largely through direct discharge into sewerage or open environments [19].

Within Nigeria specifically, a study at the University of Lagos investigated waste recycling efficiency and found that organic materials (30%), mixed plastics (28%), and paper (24%) dominate the waste stream, with substantial contamination of segregation systems owing to inadequate training and infrastructure [20]. The consequences extend beyond environmental harm: improper disposal generates direct human health risks, exacerbates global inequities through waste export to lower-income contexts, and produces avoidable institutional costs [21].

B. Green Technology Interventions for Laboratory Waste

Green laboratory waste management combines technological solutions with behavioural and governance frameworks. Evidence demonstrates that sustainable practices including waste reuse, reduced single-use plastic procurement, proper segregation, reverse logistics, and chemical waste exchange programmes — effectively reduce both environmental impact and disposal costs without compromising research quality [2, 21]. A comprehensive review of unsustainable laboratory science practices notes that greening laboratories through waste reduction and resource conservation does not have to be time or resource intensive [21].

The adoption of rational test ordering in medical laboratories; a demand-management approach to reduce unnecessary reagent use and sample processing is identified as a particularly cost-effective environmental intervention applicable to Nigerian teaching hospital laboratories [22]. Forward-looking green medical laboratory frameworks advocate for formal quality indicators and international professional association standards as the foundation for sustainable laboratory culture in clinical settings [22].

V. WATER CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE CHEMICAL PROCUREMENT

A. Water Use in Research Laboratories

Water is a frequently overlooked dimension of laboratory environmental impact. Autoclave sterilisation, cooling water systems, and wet chemistry procedures collectively place significant demands on institutional water supplies. Green laboratory certification programmes such as My Green Lab and LEAF explicitly quantify water savings as a key performance metric, with verified programmes reporting substantial reductions through improved fume hood and autoclave practices [10, 15, 17].

In water-stressed Nigerian contexts, particularly institutions in the drier north; laboratory water conservation has direct economic as well as ecological value. Installation of low-flow faucets, recirculating water systems for cooling equipment, and revised autoclave cycles represent low-capital, high-impact interventions that generate both cost savings and reduced municipal water demand [8].

B. Sustainable Procurement and the ACT Ecolabel

Procurement represents a structural lever for embedding green laboratory technology at the institutional level. The ACT (Accountability, Consistency, and Transparency) Ecolabel, developed by My Green Lab and independently verified, assigns science-based sustainability scores to laboratory products across 70+ manufacturers, covering energy use, materials, chemical hazards, and end-of-life options [23]. Procurement policies anchored by the ACT Ecolabel enable Nigerian research institutions to systematically preference lower-impact reagents and equipment during budget allocation, without sacrificing scientific performance.

International and domestic financial institutions are increasingly recognising the business case for sustainable procurement. Green bonds, grants, and concessional loans from the World Bank and the African Development Bank (AfDB) specifically target environmentally friendly technology adoption in Nigeria, including within research infrastructure [24]. TETFund's National Research Fund explicitly lists power and energy and health as priority research themes, creating an alignment opportunity for GLT-focused institutional proposals [25].

VI. THE NIGERIAN INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

A. *Structural Constraints*

Any credible analysis of GLT adoption in Nigeria must honestly reckon with the structural environment in which research institutions operate. A 2021 study published in Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics; the most comprehensive survey of Nigerian researcher challenges to date identified inadequate infrastructure, lack of steady electricity, insufficient funding, and brain drain as the foremost barriers to productive research [4]. Approximately 55.3% of respondents agreed that lack of steady electricity was a significant challenge, while 45.0% strongly agreed that inadequate infrastructure was a constraint [4].

Funding insufficiency is systemic: the federal government provides approximately 90% of university income through the NUC, yet budgetary allocations to higher education remain grossly inadequate relative to institutional needs [26]. Laboratory reagent stockouts, non-functional equipment, and delayed maintenance are routine consequences [26]. These conditions create a paradox: institutions most in need of cost-saving GLT interventions are also least positioned to make the upfront capital investments they require.

B. *Enabling Conditions and Green Pathways*

Despite structural constraints, enabling conditions for GLT adoption exist and are expanding. Nigeria's Energy Transition Plan (ETP), unveiled in 2022, sets a net-zero emissions target of 2060 and commits to deploying 5 GW of solar power by 2030 [27]. The Rural Electrification Agency's Energizing Education Programme (EEP) specifically targets universities and teaching hospitals with solar hybrid power systems, directly subsidising the most capital-intensive component of laboratory GLT adoption [28].

International evidence further suggests that institutional green technology adoption is catalysed by a combination of regulatory frameworks, national energy strategies, and donor investment; exactly the configuration emerging in Nigeria [29]. Youth engagement and capacity building in green technology are additionally identified as critical success factors, with Nigerian universities positioned to benefit from growing regional investment in STEM sustainability education [28].

VII. DUAL-IMPACT QUANTIFICATION MODEL

A. *Conceptual Framework*

The dual-impact model proposed in this paper posits that GLT adoption generates simultaneously a Cost Reduction Vector (CRV) and an Environmental Sustainability Vector (ESV). The CRV captures direct savings in energy expenditure, waste disposal costs, water charges, and procurement efficiency. The ESV captures reductions in GHG emissions, chemical contamination loads, water extraction, and waste-to-landfill volumes. These vectors are not independent: interventions such as fume hood optimisation and freezer temperature management simultaneously reduce costs and emissions, creating a compounding impact that exceeds the sum of isolated measurements.

B. *Quantitative Benchmarks for Nigerian Institutions*

Drawing on the synthesised evidence, Table 1 presents the estimated dual-impact benchmarks applicable to a typical Nigerian research institution adopting a structured GLT programme:

Intervention	**Est. Cost Saving (USD/lab/yr)**	**Est. CO_2e Reduction (tonne/yr)**	**Key Evidence Source**
Solar PV microgrid integration	30–50% energy cost reduction	Significant vs. diesel baseline	[12, 13]
Freezer temperature management	~$2,500–$10,000/lab	Included in 31.32 t avg.	[8, 15]
Fume hood optimisation	Significant utility saving	Included in 31.32 t avg.	[8, 15]
Green certification (academic)	~$39,000/lab	31.32 t CO_2e/lab	[15]

 ISSN: 3107-6513

LED lighting & energy mgmt.	20–30% energy cost reduction	Proportional to energy saved	[14, 16]
Waste management protocol	Disposal cost reduction	Reduced chemical load	[18, 21]
Sustainable procurement (ACT)	Reduced procurement unit cost	Scope 3 emission reduction	[23]

Table 1: Dual-Impact Benchmarks for Green Laboratory Technology Adoption in Nigerian Research Institutions

C. Nigerian-Specific Projections

Extrapolating from global certification data and Nigerian solar feasibility studies, a Nigerian university laboratory that installs a solar PV hybrid microgrid, raises freezer setpoints to -70°C, implements fume hood sash management protocols, and adopts formal waste segregation can conservatively expect to: (i) reduce annual energy expenditure by 30–50%; (ii) lower CO_2e emissions by a minimum of 20 tonnes per laboratory per year; (iii) reduce chemical waste disposal costs; and (iv) improve research continuity through reliable power itself a productivity and grant-competitiveness benefit [12, 13, 15]. Large hospital-based institutions with budgets exceeding the equivalent of several hundred thousand USD could achieve energy and water cost savings of approximately 30% annually, translating to millions of Naira redirected to research programmes [30].

VIII. BARRIERS AND FACILITATORS TO GLT ADOPTION

A. Barriers

Capital cost remains the foremost barrier. Green technology investments particularly solar PV systems with battery storage require substantial upfront expenditure that is difficult to justify within constrained annual budgets, even when lifecycle cost savings are favourable [11]. Institutional capacity gaps, including limited expertise in hybrid energy system design, operation, and maintenance, compound this challenge [12]. Regulatory frameworks for chemical waste management in Nigeria remain nascent, reducing the compliance pressure that drives adoption in northern institutional contexts [19, 26].

Equally important are behavioural and cultural barriers. Changing researcher habits a prerequisite for energy-saving interventions such as equipment shutdown protocols and freezer management requires sustained engagement and institutional incentive structures that are absent in most Nigerian universities [1, 4]. Supply chain vulnerabilities, import dependence for PV and battery materials, and a shallow domestic manufacturing base inflate prices and extend payback periods [12].

B. Facilitators

Several enabling factors are converging to improve the feasibility of GLT adoption. Nigeria's ETP and the REA's Energizing Education Programme create direct policy and funding pathways for campus solar integration [27, 28]. Green financing instruments including AfDB and World Bank green bonds and TETFund's National Research Fund provide mechanisms to bridge the capital investment gap [24, 25]. International sustainability frameworks such as My Green Lab Certification and LEAF provide structured, evidence-based implementation roadmaps adaptable to resource-constrained settings [15, 17].

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs 7, 9, 13) create international normative pressure on Nigerian institutions to demonstrate environmental responsibility, with growing implications for international research partnerships and grant eligibility [11]. Covenant University's solar carport installations and UNIZIK's documented energy audit experience demonstrate that Nigerian universities are not starting from zero precedents for institutional action already exist within the country [12].

IX. PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

Based on the synthesised evidence and the Nigerian institutional context, a three-phase GLT adoption framework is proposed:

Phase 1 — Foundation (Years 1–2): Conduct institution-wide energy and waste audits using the My Green Lab or LEAF assessment tool. Establish a Green Laboratory Committee with multi-stakeholder representation. Implement zero-capital or low-capital behavioural interventions: freezer temperature adjustments, equipment shutdown protocols, waste segregation systems. Secure pilot funding through TETFund's National Research Fund or international donor programmes.

Phase 2 — Investment (Years 2–4): Deploy solar PV hybrid microgrid systems using feasibility data from Phase 1 audits, prioritising HOMER-modelled site-specific designs. Procure energy-efficient laboratory equipment guided by ACT Ecolabel scores. Establish chemical waste management infrastructure and protocols aligned with international standards.

Phase 3 — Institutionalisation (Years 4+): Pursue formal green laboratory certification. Integrate sustainability targets into research grant applications and institutional performance

 ISSN: **3107-6513**

frameworks. Contribute Nigerian-context data to global green laboratory evidence bases, positioning institutions as regional leaders and enhancing international research competitiveness.

Policy reform is integral to all three phases. Nigeria's federal and state governments should revise university funding frameworks to include green infrastructure as a fundable capital expenditure category. The National Universities Commission (NUC) should incorporate laboratory sustainability metrics into accreditation standards, creating the compliance incentive structures that drive adoption across the sector.

X. 10. CONCLUSION

This paper has presented a comprehensive analysis of the dual impact of green laboratory technology adoption on operational cost reduction and environmental sustainability in Nigerian research institutions. The evidence base is unambiguous: GLT adoption delivers measurable, simultaneous benefits across fiscal and ecological dimensions. Academic laboratories implementing structured green programmes reduce energy costs by an average of approximately USD 39,000 annually and cut CO_2e emissions by over 31 metric tonnes per year. In the Nigerian context, solar PV microgrid integration offers the highest-impact single intervention, reducing energy expenditure by 30–50% while improving research reliability; itself a productivity and reputational asset.

The structural challenges facing Nigerian research institutions; chronic underfunding, inadequate infrastructure, and energy insecurity are not arguments against GLT adoption; they are precisely the conditions that make it most urgent and most impactful. The cost savings generated by GLT interventions can be reinvested in research quality, reagent availability, and staff retention, addressing the very resource constraints that currently compromise Nigerian research productivity.

The dual-impact framing proposed here offers institutional leaders, policymakers, and funders a decision-making framework that aligns fiscal responsibility with environmental stewardship. As Nigeria pursues its Energy Transition Plan targets and as research institutions seek greater international competitiveness, green laboratory technology adoption represents not merely an environmental obligation but a strategic institutional investment with measurable, quantifiable returns.

XI. DECLARATIONS

Funding: The authors gratefully acknowledge the financial support provided through the TETFund Institution-Based Research Grant, without which the successful execution of this research would have been considerably more challenging.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability: This is a narrative review; no primary data were generated. All cited sources are publicly available.

Ethical Approval: Not applicable.

XII. REFERENCES

[1] Hsia R-C, Abney-Lidahl T. Leading by Example: Two Researchers Encourage Green Laboratory Practices. NCI Frederick Research Discovery Review. National Cancer Institute, Frederick; 2023. Available from: https://ncifrederick.cancer.gov

[2] Alpdemir M, Alpdemir MF. Forward steps in green medical laboratory practices for a sustainable future. Turkish Journal of Biochemistry. 2024;49(2):115–122. doi:10.1515/tjb-2023-0186

[3] SGCI Africa. Strengthening Nigeria's Research and Innovation Funding Ecosystem [Policy Brief]. Abuja: SGCI Africa; 2025. Available from: https://sgciafrica.org

[4] Igiri BE, Okoduwa SIR, Akabuogu EP, et al. Focused Research on the Challenges and Productivity of Researchers in Nigerian Academic Institutions Without Funding. Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics. 2021;6:727228. doi:10.3389/frma.2021.727228

[5] Okoro UC, Nnaji CG. Operational reliability challenges of campus generator sets in Nigerian universities. Journal of Facilities Management. 2021;9(2):98–112.

[6] Springer Nature Community. Sustainable Laboratory Practices and Their Impact on Reducing Environmental Footprints in Research Centers and Institutions. Research Communities Blog. 2026, February. Available from: https://communities.springernature.com

[7] Atwoli L, Erhabor GE, Gbakima AA, et al. COP27 climate change conference: urgent action needed for Africa and the World. Turkish Journal of Biochemistry. 2022;47(6):545–547. doi:10.1515/tjb-2022-2362

[8] Princeton University EHS. Greening Up the Lab: Sustainable Research Practices. Office of Environmental Health and Safety; 2018. Available from: https://ehs.princeton.edu

[9] Ohamobi IN, Anyaeche IC, Oguejiofor CS, et al. Renewable Energy Integration for Cost Reduction and Academic Advancement in Nigerian Higher Education. Greenation International Journal of Engineering Science. 2025;3(1):1–18.

[10] UBC Sustainability. Green Lab Certification [Programme Description]. University of British Columbia; 2026. Available from: https://sustain.ubc.ca

[11] Adeshina MA, Ogunleye AM, Suleiman HO, et al. From Potential to Power: Advancing Nigeria's Energy Sector through Renewable Integration and Policy Reform. Sustainability. 2024;16(20):8803. doi:10.3390/su16208803

[12] Ohamobi IN, Anyaeche IC, Oguejiofor CS, et al. Renewable Energy Integration for Cost Reduction and Academic Advancement in Nigerian Higher Education. Greenation International Journal of Engineering Science. 2025;3(1). doi:10.e-greenation.org/GIJES

[13] Frontiers in Energy Research. Technical, economic, and environmental feasibility assessment of solar-battery-generator hybrid energy systems: a case study in Nigeria. 2024. doi:10.3389/fenrg.2024.1397037

[14] Nnaji C, et al. Prospects of Solar Energy Exploration in Nigeria: Assessments and Economics. International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy. 2024;14(2):1–12. doi:10.32479/ijeep.14977

[15] My Green Lab. My Green Lab Certification 2.0 Introduces New Tools and Measurable Sustainability Gains. Lab Manager Magazine. 2025 December 3. Available from: https://www.labmanager.com

[16] Rajagopalan P, et al. AI-optimised energy management systems in healthcare facilities: a review. Cited in: Green hospitals: maximizing health and climate benefits globally. Science of the Total Environment. 2025. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2025.013336

[17] University of Bristol. LEAF Green Lab Certification. Sustainability Office; 2026. Available from: https://www.bristol.ac.uk/sustainability

[18] Fagnani KC, Guimarães JR. Waste management plan for higher education institutions in developing countries: The Continuous Improvement Cycle model. Journal of Cleaner Production. 2017;147:108–118. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.01.080

[19] Manyele SV, Anicetus H, Bilia JL. Environmental and public health risks associated with chemical waste from research and educational laboratories in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. ACS Chemical Health & Safety. 2015;22(2):13–21. doi:10.1016/j.jchas.2015.01.015

[20] Nnenna LN, et al. Solid waste recycling within higher education in developing countries: a case study of the University of Lagos. Journal of Material Cycles and Waste Management. 2022;24:2283–2296. doi:10.1007/s10163-022-01569-5

[21] Nwobi NL, Anetor GO, Nwobi JC, et al. (Un)Sustainable Science: Greening Practices in Research, Clinical Microbiology, and Veterinary Laboratories Locally and Globally. mSphere. 2025;10(2). PMC11825989. doi:10.1128/msphere.00791-24

[22] Alpdemir M. Forward steps in green medical laboratory practices for a sustainable future. De Gruyter Brill Open Access. 2024. doi:10.1515/tjb-2023-0186

[23] My Green Lab. The ACT Ecolabel: The Standard for Lab Product Sustainability [Programme Description]. 2025. Available from: https://mygreenlab.org/programs/act-ecolabel

[24] African Scholar Publishers. Conceptual Study on Green Manufacturing and Waste Management in Nigeria. African Journal of Business and Economic Research. 2025;7(1):469. Available from: https://africanscholarpub.com

[25] TETFund. Federal Government Approves Over N5.1 Billion Research Grants [Press Release]. Abuja: Tertiary Education Trust Fund; 2024 January 29.

[26] Opara PI, Ajimuse MS. Challenges in Ownership and Funding Practices of Nigerian Universities. Journal of Academic Education Management and Policy Practice. 2024;6(2):132–140.

[27] Dinneya-Onuoha E. Unlocking renewable energy materials in Nigeria: availability, application, and roadmap for sustainability. RSC Sustainability. 2025;3(6):2534–2566. doi:10.1039/D5SU00121H

[28] Africa Policy Research Institute (APRI). Youth Inclusion in Green Technology in Africa: A Policy Landscape Analysis of Nigeria, Kenya and Ghana. Berlin: APRI; 2025. Available from: https://afripoli.org

[29] Acheampong AO, Opoku EEO, Dzator J, et al. Innovation, institutions, and sustainability: Evaluating drivers of household green technology adoption and environmental sustainability of Africa. Gondwana Research. 2024;130:1–18. doi:10.1016/j.gr.2024.00086

[30] Frontiers in Public Health. Greening the future of healthcare: implementation of sustainability strategies in German hospitals and beyond — a review. 2025. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2025.1559132