

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJARR_126562 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Evaluation Of Waste Management Policy In Talumelito Landfill In Gorontalo Province |
| Type of the Article | |

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|---|---|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>This manuscript presents a valuable contribution to the field of public policy evaluation and waste management economics. The study offers a comprehensive analysis of waste management policy implementation using William Dunn's six criteria framework (effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, equity, responsiveness, and accuracy), providing important insights into the operational and economic challenges faced by regional waste management facilities. The findings are particularly relevant for developing economies struggling with similar waste management infrastructure and policy implementation issues.</p> | |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> | <p>The title is appropriate and accurately reflects the content and scope of the research</p> | |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>The abstract would benefit from significant restructuring to enhance its clarity and impact. While it currently provides comprehensive findings, it needs to be more concise and better organized. First, consider reducing redundancy by avoiding repeated mentions of "Talumelito Landfill" - mention it once at the beginning and use "the facility" or "the site" thereafter. For example, instead of "Efficiency shows that Talumelito landfill has contributed...", simply state "The facility has contributed...". The abstract should include the study period, which is currently missing. Add a brief mention such as "...conducted during 2023" to provide temporal context. Also, when describing the methodology, be more specific about the scale of research - for instance, indicate the number of interviews conducted or the observation period. Consider restructuring the findings section. Rather than listing six separate points, synthesize the key findings into 2-3 main themes. For example, combine operational challenges (effectiveness and efficiency) into one statement, and community impact (equity and responsiveness) into another. Finally, add a concluding sentence about the study's implications or recommendations. This could be a brief statement such as "The findings suggest the need for policy reforms to enhance operational efficiency and community engagement in waste management practices." These changes would reduce the abstract from its current length while making it more informative and engaging for readers.</p> | |
| <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> | <p>The manuscript's structure follows a logical flow but needs some improvements. Add a theoretical framework section before the methodology and a separate literature review section. Expand the methodology section with more details on data collection and analysis procedures</p> | |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>The manuscript demonstrates robust scientific methodology through its systematic application of Dunn's policy evaluation framework and comprehensive data triangulation methods. The research validity is strengthened by combining multiple data collection techniques including interviews, direct observations, and document analysis. The findings are well-supported by concrete operational data and stakeholder feedback, establishing clear connections between empirical evidence and policy implications.</p> | |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p> | <p>The reference list requires substantial updating to enhance its academic rigor. Current citations should be strengthened by incorporating recent publications from 2020-2024, particularly ones that provide both local and international perspectives. For example: For local context, consider recent Indonesian studies such as "Waqf-based Waste Management: A Proposed Model" by Riani and Fatoni and "Dynamics of Local Government Policy in Waste Management" by Maesarini (2023), which offer valuable insights into current policy implementation challenges and innovative financing approaches in Indonesia. For international comparative perspectives, "Bridging the Gap: Tailoring Waste Management Strategies for Sustainable Outcomes in Developing Countries" by Mochammad (2024) and "Environmental Assessment of Solid Waste Pollution of Urban Areas" by Aitimbetova et al. (2023) would provide</p> | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | valuable insights from similar developing contexts on policy implementation, community engagement, and environmental assessment approaches. These additions would strengthen your analysis by providing both local and international contemporary perspectives on waste management policy implementation, community engagement, and sustainable practices in developing contexts. | |
| <u>Minor REVISION</u> comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Requires moderate English language editing to enhance its clarity and professionalism. For instance, in the methodology section, sentences like "To find data about waste management..." should be restructured to "Data collection for waste management analysis...". Terminology varies throughout the paper - terms like "waste processing" and "waste treatment" are used interchangeably and should be standardized. Additionally, punctuation errors, particularly in complex sentences with multiple clauses, need correction to improve readability and professional presentation. | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | This manuscript could be enhanced through several practical improvements in its presentation and content. The current keywords are too generic and should be enhanced to better reflect the study's specific focus - consider using more precise compound terms such as "Waste Management Policy" and "Environmental Governance" while adding contextual keywords like "Regional Development" and "Indonesian Environmental Policy" to improve the paper's discoverability in academic databases and better represent its comprehensive scope. The table-based data would be more impactful as visual graphs showing seasonal patterns and processing challenges. Qualitative analysis needs strengthening through direct stakeholder quotes, such as drivers' actual feedback about rainy season difficulties. The methodology requires specific details about the research timeframe, number of interviews conducted, and respondent selection process. Finally, recommendations should be transformed into actionable steps - for instance, replacing general suggestions like "improve waste sorting" with specific proposals such as "implement weekly community sorting training" or "establish monthly feedback meetings." These enhancements would make the research more credible and useful while remaining within the author's available resources. | |

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: | Timofei Olga |
| Department, University & Country | National Institute for Economic Research, Academy of Economic Studies of Moldova, Moldova |