

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_107473</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>An Overview of Solid Waste Management Scenario and a Comparative Analysis of its Related Legislation in India</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Short communication</b>

### 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>The manuscript is very imports for scientific community since solid waste management is an issues for many countries not only in India. It will an informative study for many scholars in the area.</b></li> <li>2. <b>The title is suitable</b></li> <li>3. <b>The abstract is comprehensive, but the author need to provide to the reader a small idea on the methodology used, a general main findings and recommendation</b></li> <li>4. <b>Subsections are appropriate for the content presented under the sections but sections are inadequate, and this will explain in point 5</b></li> <li>5. <b>The situation presented may be correct for India, but the author missed a) looking some review of the global concern on the Solid management issues, b) connecting or confronting the government policies to the really practice by community members, c) connecting her/his study to the SDGs which was mentioned earlier in the abstract, d) in the conclusion, the author recommends to consider two dimensions as far as solid management is concerned. The dimensions are mentioned to be 'financial sustainability' and 'environmental sustainability' and the author ends there in suspension. Yet, these could be a very important dimensions that would add an important value to the discussion. For a example, are this dimensions in conflict with each other? Whose this recommendation addressed to in relation to the policies and practices at hand</b></li> <li>6. <b>The references are okay for a very local study, but as mentioned in point 5, the scientific study should include a few confrontations of scholars ideas from different places to help build and bring a meaning to her/his study</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	Yes, but need a bit of proof reading	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The study is very interesting but I suggest the author to consider comments on points 3, 5 and 6 above to bring meaning to the paper under discussion	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Penine Uwimbabazi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Protestant Institute of Arts and Social Sciences, Rwanda</b>