| | |
|---|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Engineering Research and Reports |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms_JERR_45714** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **An Appraisal of the Municipal Solid Waste Management in Ado Ekiti, Nigeria, Using the Rating Index of the Users and Operatives** |
| Type of the Article | **Original Research Article** |

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 1: Review Comments**

| | **Reviewer's comment** | **Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
|---|---|---|
| **Compulsory** REVISION comments | This paper "An Appraisal of the Municipal Solid Waste Management in Ado Ekiti,Nigeria, Using the Rating Index of the Users ad Operatives" conducted an assessment of the existing waste management system in a city of Nigeria. Data for the study was collected using questionnaires. In my opinion, the paper has the lack of originality except the study area under consideration as well as the scientific base of the study is not sound<br><br>Introduction: This part has been unnecessarily very descriptive, what do all these descriptive details mean. At the end of this section, there is no clear statement of the rationale behind the study; why is it being done and what is the contribution actually made?<br><br>Materials and methods: "A sample size of 150 was deemed appropriate" Explain the basis for selection of sample size for the study, describe the period of study etc.<br>The rest of the manuscript reads like the authors had this Likert's scale in mind that they wanted to apply, but for what purpose, review the methodology section to provide some details related to the used scale and the basis for its selection.<br>It is a part of the introduction that you describe the situation. Reduce it and move to the introduction section.<br><br>Results and discussion: This part needs to be fully rewritten. You include info that are generic comments and other information that should have been included in the introduction. The rating procedure is quite simple and the sample size is not enough to draw some conclusions. Too many tables are presented for limited data that can be summed up to make one or two tables. The results you try to conclude are weak and merely based on some filled questionnaires<br><br>Conclusion shouldn't be just a summary of the study results. The conclusion does not state any suggestion for system improvement and how the study can affect decision-making. The impact of the study must be explained clearly and be visible throughout the paper. | |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | | |
| **Optional/General** comments | | |

**PART 2:**

| | **Reviewer's comment** | **Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
|---|---|---|
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | |

**Reviewer Details:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: | ***Asma Majeed*** |
| Department, University & Country | ***University of the Punjab, Pakistan*** |