

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_101583
Title of the Manuscript:	Pivotal role of microbes in solid waste management
Type of the 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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The research is good for scientific community, but, only when amended to bring out the comprehensibility of the findings.</p> <p>Abstract is not comprehensive. The objectives of the research are not stated, methodology, results, and conclusion were not captured. To be specific, the abstract need to be rephrased. It should include the objectives of the study, method used in carrying out the work, results obtained, conclusion and recommendation.</p> <p>No problem</p> <p>The results are scientifically correct.</p> <p>Authors need to be consistent with styles of writing references and reconcile some citation within text and the reference sections, which I have highlighted.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	No problem, but should be improved	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The major problem is with the abstract and conclusion sections which the Authors need to improve on. They should recast it to highlight the significance of the study	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rakiya Abdullahi
Department, University & Country	University of Maiduguri, Nigeria