

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)
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.	I have reviewed the manuscript titled "Intelligent Technologies to Support Waste Management" – I dislike this manuscript, because this manuscript heavily relies on references without providing substantial original research or analysis	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Not suitable "Exploring Intelligent Technologies for Waste Management: A Comprehensive Literature Review"	
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 abstract primarily consists of a combination of existing literature and fails to clearly communicate the original research or contribution of the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript lacks clear subsections and an appropriate structure, which significantly impacts its readability and coherence.	
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.	The manuscript does not demonstrate a sufficient level of scientific depth or rigor. The research methodology is not clearly defined, and there is a lack of empirical evidence to support the claims made. This diminishes the credibility of the research. From a technical standpoint, the manuscript contains gaps in the explanation of methods, data analysis, and results interpretation	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
Optional/General comments	Given the lack of original research and insufficient analytical depth, I believe the manuscript is not suitable for publication in its current form.	

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:	M. Suresh Kumar
Department, University & Country	Sri Chandrasekharendra Saraswathi Viswa Mahavidyalaya, India