

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Environment &amp; Ecology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_128269
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Medical Waste Management Practices at Gitega Regional Hospital, Burundi: A Case Study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It gives a detailed account of information about the plight of staff at Gitega Regional Hospital. But it lacks to assimilate the other official governmental reports and surveys in the analysis part. Synthesis of qualitative and quantitative research is missing.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Alternative title- Assessment & Evaluation of Medical Waste Management Practices: A case study of Gitega Regional Hospital, Burundi.	
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.	Yes the abstract is well structured and comprehensive. In the objective of the paper add the red marked words. This study was carried out to identify <b>and analyze</b> the factors hindering optimal MWM at Gitega Regional Hospital, central province of Burundi.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it's correct. Graphical representation of data can help to understand data & identify patterns easily instead of lots of tabular representation. Epi info software should be used more judiciously. Plenty of data interpretation but still lacking to explain the overall scenario. Try to complement the hospital's staff perspective towards medical waste management. Table 2's and 7's explanation part is weak. Replace the word chapter from the text mentioned under the discussion part.  A cross-sectional survey was conducted among 135 healthcare providers involved in the hospital's waste management chain. In this chapter, we present and discuss the study findings, comparing them with relevant literature from similar contexts.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Strong vocabulary is essential for effective and comprehensive research writing, which is missing in the present article.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Anuja Yadav
Department, University & Country	SSGPG College Faridabad, India