

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSE_128726
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of the Potential of Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) Technology as a Waste Management Solution in Medan City
Type of the 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.	The problem of waste and how to process it is a problem for many areas. The results of the study are very interesting because they try to describe waste processing activities in the city of Medan.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title discusses RDF analysis for waste processing activities in Medan. However, in the discussion of the analysis in question is SWOT. Why not just give the title about SWOT.	
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.	The description in the abstract has been explained well. Maybe it could be explained further about the analysis that will be done. Improvements to the title and the SWOT analysis that was done would provide more appropriate results.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	In general, the results of the activities have been described well. There needs to be some improvements in some of the use of syllables. What do you mean by PLTU? Please use more appropriate English. The potential of this RDF is not explained further regarding the potential energy that can be generated through the power plant system. Further studies are needed. The scoring of the SWOT analysis is unclear. Provide your reference for scoring the entire SWOT analysis table.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are very lacking. Please use references from international journals with a period of the last 10 years. Add at least 25 more references to support your writing.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Pretty good.	
Optional/General comments	The writing has described the results of the activity well. Some more improvements are needed.	

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:	I Made Aditya Nugraha
Department, University & Country	Marine and Fisheries Polytechnic of Kupang, Indonesia