

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_95580
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Awareness about Electronic Waste in Tayma Governorate, Tabuk region, Saudi Arabia
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>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The manuscript is part of empirical researchs about E Waste. This study was carried out to evaluate the awareness about electronic waste (e-waste) disposal and management practices. The results are clearly presented. 2. Householders And Governmental Agencies Electronic Waste Awareness in Tayma Governorate, Saudi Arabia 3. The abstract is informative and contains the objectives, methods and results of the study. It is better if the explanation of survey results between household respondents and government agencies is separated because they have different characteristics 4. Structure of manuscript is appropriate 5. The use of the scientific method is in accordance with the type of research being conducted. However the theoretical basis that is in accordance with the research has not been explained	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Extensive editing of English language and style required	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rahmat Nurcahyo
Department, University & Country	Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia