

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_127508
Title of the Manuscript:	Financial, Institutional, Environmental, Technical, and Social Evaluation of Waste Management in Tamale Metropolis
Type of the Article	Research paper

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: 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)
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.	Environmental protection, conservation of natural resources, safer living conditions, economic benefit, resources efficiency and reduce waste.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Please focus the abstract on your study. No, mention of objective of the study, research design, sample and sampling technique research analysis and core findings. Omit unnecessary explain.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Need major revision for publication	
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.	1. Lack of clarity in general background and specific background missing 2. Need to correlate general and specific background. 3. Research problem missing (highlight it in brief). 4. Research gap missing, need to established research gap 5. Highlight the statement of the problem and why you carry out this research work. 6. Purpose of your research. Explain in brief? 7. How is your work different from other research work done in Ghana. 8. Highlight the objective of the study and hypothesis. 9. I would prefer to see bigger data on waste management.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References of the current study are required.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Not up to the standard	
Optional/General comments	This paper has a potential to be accepted for publication, but some important points have to be clarified. 1. Abstract is inadequate 2. Lack of clarity in introduction 3. Methodology part not clear 4. Objective and hypothesis missing Results/findings not satisfactory	

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:	Chubakumzuk Jamir
Department, University & Country	Yingli College, India