

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_126562
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation Of Waste Management Policy In Talumelito Landfill In Gorontalo Province
Type of the Article	Research Article

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript addresses a significant environmental and policy issue within waste management. The study provides a comprehensive evaluation of the waste management policy in the Talumelito landfill, which is crucial for understanding the challenges and potential improvements in landfill management in Gorontalo Province. The findings of this study are valuable for the scientific community, as they highlight the policy gaps and practical inefficiencies that affect waste management effectiveness. By providing insight into the operational and policy constraints faced, this study can guide further research and policy improvement in similar contexts. Overall, the manuscript contributes meaningfully to environmental policy evaluation literature.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title accurately reflects the scope of the manuscript. <b>Suggested Title (if applicable):</b> No change suggested.	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract is informative and provides a clear overview of the objectives and main findings. However, adding more specific data or highlighting critical quantitative findings would strengthen the abstract's informativeness. <b>Suggestions for Abstract Improvements:</b> Mention specific numerical findings or statistical outcomes to enhance clarity and impact.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes, the manuscript is well-organized into logical sections covering effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, equity, responsiveness, and accuracy.	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript is scientifically robust as it applies qualitative research methods appropriate for policy evaluation, and the findings align with documented issues in landfill management practices. The use of established frameworks and theories enhances the credibility of the analysis. While the findings are based on qualitative observations, the manuscript presents a reliable assessment of the operational and policy-related challenges in waste management. The study provides actionable recommendations that can help improve waste management practices, making it technically sound and valuable.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :	The references are relevant and generally up-to-date; however, the manuscript would benefit from including additional recent studies on landfill policy improvements and modern waste management technologies.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The manuscript requires minor language editing to enhance clarity and readability. Attention to grammatical structure and word choice will improve the scholarly tone.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript covers essential aspects of waste management policy evaluation comprehensively and provides recommendations for improvement. Minor adjustments in language and abstract detail will increase its effectiveness in scholarly communication.  This manuscript would benefit from revisions addressing abstract details, language clarity, and methodological transparency for improved scholarly communication and technical strength.	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Khalak Abararahemad Abdulrazzak</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Gujarat Technological University, India</b>