

## ReviewForm 1.7

JournalName:	<a href="#">ArchivesofCurrentResearchInternational</a>
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_ACRI_99091
TitleoftheManuscript:	ASSESSMENTOF SOLIDWASTEMANAGEMENTMETHODSIN SOMESELECTEDPARTSOFOWERRIWEST,IMOSTATE,NIGERIA.
TypeoftheArticle	

### **Generalguidelinefor PeerReviewprocess:**

Thisjournal'speerreviewpolicystatesthat**NO**manuscriptshouldberejectedonlyonthebasisof'**lackofNovelty**',providedthemanuscriptis scientificallyrobustandtechnically sound.ToknowthecompleteguidelineforPeerReviewprocess,reviewersarerequestedtovisitthis link:

(<https://www.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/editorial-policy>)

**ReviewForm 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><b>Compulsory</b> 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. The manuscript is important for scientific community. Understand how the population handles with solid waste is important for the environment and health.</p> <p>2. The abstract is clear and completed. The objectives, methodology, results and conclusions are clear.</p> <p>3. The article is well written and easy to understand.</p> <p>4. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>5. The references of the article are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The article is well written and easy to understand.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>What actions should be taken to improve the solid waste management?</p>	

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Celina Kakitani Ofuchi
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Technology, Brazil