

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Geological Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOGER_86657
Title of the Manuscript:	Waste Management Practices Among Trading Type of Business in Selected Municipalities of Davao Occidental
Type of the Article	

### **General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://journalajoger.com/index.php/AJOGER/editorial-policy>

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>1. The authors wrote down the goal "To know the waste management practices of trading type of business in selected municipalities of Davao Occidental province", but it is not clear why they need such information. That is, the goal is not formulated completely, it must be finalized. Namely, the authors should indicate why they want "To know the waste management practices..."</p> <p>2. Research Design is poorly presented. It is not clear what the descriptive method means. What approach was taken by the authors? If the authors simply described the situation, then this does not look like a study. The results should be subjected to analytical analysis and discussion. Perhaps the authors used the method of observation or the method of comparison? Or, for example, any other from the list below: methods of interview, conversation or survey content analysis method (study of texts and documents) compositional, discourse, semantic and other types of analysis method of linguistic experiment testing positive, normative, static, dynamic and other types of analysis scaling method and others</p> <p>3. From what number of respondents were 15 respondents randomly selected? Did every respondent agree to participate in the survey, or were there randomly selected respondents who refused to participate in the survey? How many respondents refused? Is the reason for the denial known? The composition of the sample is slightly apprehensive</p> <p>4. How were the respondents' records checked? What grounds to trust the respondents? <b>MATERIAL AND METHODS</b> should be reviewed</p> <p>5. The results are well presented, but there is no discussion. How do the authors understand these results: is this a good situation or a bad one? What are the prospects for this practice? What are the problems in this area? The authors should discuss the results obtained. It will be useful to compare these results with the situation in other countries with a similar standard of living, in countries where the standard of living is higher and where it is lower. It is desirable to propose solutions for the development of this positive experience and its strengthening in the consciousness of society, etc.</p> <p>6. The reference is presented very poorly and some sources are quite old. I recommend expanding the list of sources: - in charge to add discussion problems in the country and in the world and thereby analyze the newest sources of information (not older than 2015) - add a discussion of the results and compare with the situation in other countries - this also contributes to an increase in the number of old sources. The Reference list shows how detailed the authors have studied the scientific problem. Perhaps this problem no longer exists and it has already been solved by someone. In this case, it can be recommended to take an already existing evidence-based decision for the implementation of such a practice in your country.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

**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:	Viola Vambol
Department, University & Country	Yuri Kondratyuk Poltava Polytechnic, Ukraine