

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_129991
Title of the Manuscript:	SOLID WASTE COLLECTION AND DISPOSAL METHODS BY HOUSEHOLDS IN BEKWARRA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA AND ITS EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT
Type of the Article	

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 manuscript discusses problems of solid waste management in the Bekwarra Local Government Area, Nigeria, emphasizing the necessity of sustainable approaches as well as the negative effects that inefficient systems have on the environment and human health. It advances knowledge of waste management issues both within and outside the study area. The study highlights the pressing need for sustainable waste management techniques and provides information for public health experts, environmental advocates, and legislators.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the manuscript, "Solid Waste Collection and Disposal Methods by Households in Bekwarra Local Government Area and Its Effect on the Environment," is clear and conveys the focus of the study. However, it could be improved for a more concise and engaging title while retaining clarity. Since the study focused on household waste in Nigeria, I suggest the authors include "Nigeria" in the title. I suggest the following as a title: "Household Solid Waste Management Practices and Environmental Impacts in Bekwarra Local Government Area, Nigeria."	Title has been revised

Review Form 3

<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 provides a fairly thorough summary of the study's background, methodology, findings, and conclusions.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>Although the manuscript is scientifically sound, it could benefit from a few minor improvements in transparency of the methodology, a more thorough examination of the findings, and an extension of the suggestions.</p> <p>1. It is unclear whether the questionnaire's pre-test in a nearby local government was formally examined for validity and reliability. Therefore the authors may want to clearly address this. Although biases like social desirability or recall bias are common in studies of this kind, how did the authors make sure these biases were minimized by using self-reported data?</p> <p>2. To ascertain the relationship between variables, the authors suitably employed SPSS and Chi-square tests. However, the handling of any missing data during analysis is not specifically mentioned. More details about how confounding variables (like socioeconomic status) were taken into account could be included in the manuscript.</p> <p>3. Results are presented in sufficient detail, and correlations (such as those between waste disposal techniques and education) are statistically significant. Nevertheless, 1) some results are descriptive but could use more inferential statistics to support conclusions; 2) some unexpected findings are not explored in the discussion, such as the fact that 59% of respondents lacked storage containers despite having a high level of waste disposal knowledge.</p> <p>4. Although the conclusions make sense and are supported by the data, they could be broadened to cover particular tactics, like incorporating public-private partnerships for waste management.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is written in a formal, understandable style appropriate for scientific publications. Small grammatical errors and sporadic repetitions (such as excessively thorough descriptions of sampling techniques) may make the text less readable.</p> <p>6. The authors mention that study questionnaires were structured in to part: A - socio-demographic data and B - considered the types of waste generated, methods of waste collection and disposal and self-reported health problems associated with solid waste disposal by respondents. However, only data from part B were adequately presented and discussed. What happened to the data from part A? What was its importance to the study's objective?</p>	<p>Revision included accordingly</p> <p>Corrected as suggested</p> <p>Done revision</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Some of the references, including ADB (2002), Rotich et al. (2006), and Mukisa (2009), are quite old. More recent sources (from the last five to ten years) should be included to reflect current practices, policies, and advancements because waste management is a dynamic field. More recent and high-impact references (from 2015 onward) from publications or studies on the following topics might be of interest to the authors: Environmental impacts of waste management in developing nations; Policy and community-based waste management models; and Sustainable solid waste management (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envc.2024.100869). The authors might think about including recent publications on waste management tactics and their effects on public health from international organizations (such as the UNEP, World Bank, and WHO). reports on sustainable practices, such as the World Bank's What a Waste 2.0 Report (2018; https://books.google.de/books?id=bnN_DwAAQBAJ) or UNEP waste reports (https://www.unep.org/topics/chemicals-and-pollution-action/waste).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● "Davidson, 2011" was cited in the text but was not included in the reference list. ● The authors must provide Digital Object Identifier (DOI) for all cited references. 	<p>Ok done</p>

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript's language quality is generally appropriate for academic communication, although some parts could be improved. Thus, there are a few minor grammatical mistakes, awkward sentence structures, and phrasing errors. One example is the inconsistent use of singular and plural forms (e.g., "a self-developed questionnaires").</p> <p>- The logical flow of ideas is impacted by the occasionally abrupt transitions between sentences and sections. Coherence could be increased by rewording sentences or adding linking phrases. Certain expressions are better suited for everyday conversation than for scholarly writing. For instance: "Thus, an inefficient municipal solid waste management system may create serious negative environmental impacts like infectious diseases, land and water pollution, obstruction of drains and loss of biodiversity." might be revised to read: "Inefficient municipal solid waste management systems contribute to significant environmental issues, including the proliferation of infectious diseases, land and water contamination, drainage obstruction, and biodiversity loss."</p> <p>- Readability is impacted by irregular or absent punctuation, such as in compound sentences.</p> <p>To ensure linguistic accuracy, the authors could have a professional academic editing service or an English scholar proofread the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expand the introduction to give a more comprehensive global viewpoint on the problems with SWM and how they connect to the unique situation in Bekwarra. This will place the study in a broader context. 2. Clearly identify the gap in the literature that the research attempts to fill. This gives the rational of the study more substance and precision. 3. Make sure the goals of the study are clear and consistent with the research questions and conclusions. 4. Give additional details regarding the outcomes of the pre-test that was carried out in the Yala Local Government Area. Did this lead to any changes being made to the questionnaires? 5. Talk about the methods used to guarantee the validity and dependability of the data collection tools. 6. Highlight the similarities and differences between findings and earlier research. This illustrates how pertinent the study is to the body of current literature. 7. Expand the conversation by critically evaluating the findings in light of Bekwarra-specific socioeconomic, cultural, and infrastructure factors. For example: What causes the discrepancy between knowledge and practice regarding waste disposal? Which particular interventions or policies have proven effective in comparable contexts, and how might they be modified for Bekwarra? 8. The authors must provide section numbering to facilitate easy navigation of the manuscript. 9. The authors said the actual sample size for the study was 400 as was determined under Sample Size Determination. However, the authors claimed a total of 400 participants completed the questionnaires, and continued to say that this 400 constituted 99.2% under the results. What happened to the 0.8%? 10. "The use of open containers by the indigenes was observed to be the most common method practice with 61.8% while the lest method practice was the use of sack bags (2.5%)." The authors may want to discuss what could account for this. 11. "From figure 1, the study showed that majority of the respondents produced vegetable waste (15%), ash waste (14%), wood waste (13%) and plastic rubber waste (13%), while a few of the respondents produced clothing/rag waste (5%) and food waste (3%)." The authors may want to discuss these findings in relation to the socio-demographics of the respondents and the settings of the study communities to better paint a clear picture to their audience. 12. The authors may revise the "discussion" section thoroughly to reflect the results. The current state of the results appears to be more of presenting findings from the study rather than discussing the results. 	

Review Form 3

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>	