

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ JSRR _124022
Title of the Manuscript:	Intelligent Technologies to Support Waste Management
Type of the Article	Review 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: 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 is highly significant for the scientific community as it delves into the application of advanced technologies in solid waste management, a critical area of urban sustainability. By reviewing the integration of ICT, AI, and IoT, the paper highlights innovative approaches to enhance waste management efficiency, reduce environmental impact, and support the development of smart cities. The manuscript's thorough examination of these technologies offers valuable insights for researchers, policymakers, and industry professionals striving to tackle the challenges of modern waste management. I appreciate the manuscript for its timely and relevant content, as it contributes to the ongoing discourse on sustainable practices and technology-driven solutions in waste management.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Intelligent Technologies to Support Waste Management" is clear and appropriate, reflecting the manuscript's focus. It encapsulates the paper's key content without being too broad.</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 is comprehensive but could benefit from a clearer breakdown of the four technologies (spatial, identification, data collection, and data transmission) mentioned in the manuscript. Consider adding a sentence or two to explicitly state their role in an integrated waste management system to enhance clarity.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript is generally well-organized with clear subsections for each topic. However, the transition between discussions on spatial technology and AI applications could be smoother to maintain flow. Consider reordering sections to improve logical progression.</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>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The application of smart technologies such as AI and IoT in waste management is a well-established approach, and the authors have done a commendable job in reviewing relevant studies. The focus on real-time monitoring and the use of data analytics for route optimization and waste sorting is particularly timely, given the global push towards sustainable urban systems. The manuscript offers solid theoretical backing and is supported by a wide array of references that underscore its relevance.</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 references are sufficient and mostly recent. However, there is room to add more recent studies (within the last two years) on blockchain applications in waste management and AI-based recycling systems to strengthen the review. Suggested additions:</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is mostly suitable for scholarly communication, but a few grammatical issues need correction, such as in the introduction where some sentences are overly complex. Simplifying the sentence structure in certain parts will improve readability.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>No ethical issues have been identified in this manuscript. The manuscript does not involve human or animal subjects, and the data used appears to be from publicly available sources. If any ethical considerations exist, the authors should clarify them in the manuscript.</p> <p>There are no competing interest issues mentioned. The authors should confirm if they have any conflicts of interest, and if none, it should be clearly stated in the manuscript.</p> <p>No obvious plagiarism has been detected in this manuscript based on the review. However, the manuscript should be checked using plagiarism detection software to ensure originality. The authors should verify that all sources are properly cited and paraphrased where necessary.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Abir Ornob
Department, University & Country	Rajshahi University of Engineering & Technology, Bangladesh