

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_103524
Title of the Manuscript:	Issues of solid waste management and ways of recovering them at the Mfidi market in the municipality Of Ngaba in Kinshasa
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:

(<https://www.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This manuscript highlights the circular economy, deserves to be fine-tuned for publication.</p> <p>2. A proposed title has been formulated to better highlight the features of the manuscript. It is : « <i>Sustainable recovery of urban organic waste: A case study of composting waste from the Mfidi market in Kinshasa (Democratic Republic of the Congo)</i> »</p> <p>3. I propose a compact, one-paragraph abstract that announces in one sentence the context, then the objective of the work, followed by the methodology, the outstanding results and the conclusion.</p> <p>4. Proposals have been made in the manuscript.</p> <p>5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct (i.e. the problem addressed, the methodology which is correct). It will just be necessary to present certain parts well</p> <p>6. References should be harmonized according to the recommendations of the journal. For example, dates and paginations should appear at the end of references.</p> <p>7. The results of the waste typology must be updated, explained and justified (ie discussion), just like the others. This should start with the quantities and proportions of waste, their final destinations, through to the results of the experiment (i.e. characteristics of the compost, plant growth, etc.). The results should be well discussed.</p> <p>8. The results obtained in this study must be clearly stated in one paragraph (what should be retained from the work), then the recommendations in another paragraph.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The manuscript must be read by peers to improve the language level.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The manuscript contains all my observations. However, the subject is of scientific interest and will be of interest to many readers. The content of the manuscript therefore needs to be better structured.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Franck Michaël Zahui
Department, University & Country	University of Man, Côte d'Ivoire