

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>                           |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_CJAST_110042   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Quantification and characterization of solid waste at Lead City University, Ibadan, Nigeria |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research Article   |

### 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><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>The study is very local and would gain a greater purpose if comparing to other studies performed in the same area.</p> <p>Title too similar to the paper on ResearchGate "Characterization of Solid Wastes in the Non-Residential Areas of the University of Ibadan, Nigeria"</p> <p>Abstract is well written although it misses sharing test results and only brings basic numbers. Moreover, lacks showing a conclusion that links results to a bigger picture.</p> <p>The paper is well structured, however there is no discussion section and the conclusion did not add any useful information to Science or even local solid waste management. Authors should relate results to a bigger picture.</p> <p>Methods Analysis lacked explaining if tests' requirements (distribution and independence) were attended so they could be used. The descriptive analysis using % lacks describing what was the confidence interval for each group. Graphs would benefit from a better visual design.</p> <p>References need to be properly standardized. Also, they are very local and do not explore world vision for solid waste research and management. Worth having a look at:<br/>Hoorweg, D., &amp; Bhada-Tata, P. (2012). What a waste: a global review of solid waste management.<br/>Reddy, P. J. (2011). Municipal solid waste management. The Netherlands: CRC Press/Balkema.<br/>Retrieved October, 9, 2012.</p> |   |
| <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>   | <p>English needs revision to choose more technical terms.</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>   |  |   |

**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>Bianca Vieira</b>                   |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University of Glasgow, Scotland</b> |