

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_130900
Title of the Manuscript:	Typology, composition and characterization of solid urban waste in the industrial area of Bobo-Dioulasso (Burkina Faso)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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: 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.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into solid waste characterization in an industrial zone, which is a crucial environmental issue, especially in developing regions. The study systematically categorizes waste, analyzes its composition, and assesses potential environmental hazards such as heavy metal contamination. The findings contribute to the broader discourse on waste management and can aid in the development of more effective policies for sustainable waste disposal. Additionally, the study's focus on industrial waste highlights the need for improved regulations in waste management practices.	OK
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title accurately reflects the study's objectives, methodology, and scope. It clearly communicates the focus on waste typology, composition, and characterization in the Bobo-Dioulasso industrial area.	OK
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>The abstract is comprehensive, summarizing the study's objectives, methods, and key findings. However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>It could be more concise by focusing on key results without excessive detail on methodology.</li><li>The practical implications of the study should be emphasized more.</li><li>Specific data (e.g., heavy metal concentrations) are useful but should be limited to key highlights.</li></ul>	<p>Systematic sampling of thirteen landfills identified by on-site observation carried out taking into account the density and heterogeneity of the waste; The characterization is carried out through the evaluation of the physico-chemical parameters and the contents of heavy metals contained in the waste.</p> <p>The results reveal several categories of waste, namely fine waste (26.58%), plastics (20.72%), glasses (13.86%) and textiles (11.38%) which account for 72.54% of waste. The other categories (putrescible, paper/cardboard, unclassified fuels, metals, unclassified incombustible and hazardous waste) account for 27.46%. The density of the waste is 6.34 kg/m². Household and industrial waste are present at 71.47% and 23.92% respectively on average. The D13 landfill contains 100% industrial waste. Agricultural waste (2.21%) and medical waste (0.43%) remain low compared to other types of waste. Organic waste predominates in the majority of landfills with an overall average of 60.93%. However, glassware (13.38%) and metal scrap (1.36%) are less present. Composable waste is 56.21%, semi-inert (18.73%) and inert (37.66). Non-hazardous waste predominates in landfills with an average of 71.63%, although potentially hazardous waste reaches high levels (50.70%). The measured parameters indicate waste with a low acid pH (6.50) and an organic matter of up to 68.84%, indicating a high degree of heterogeneity.</p>
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>The manuscript is well-structured, following a clear and logical flow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>Introduction:</b> Provides strong background information and justification for the study.</li><li><b>Methodology:</b> Clearly describes waste sampling, characterization techniques, and statistical analyses.</li><li><b>Results and Discussion:</b> Well-organized with appropriate figures and tables.</li><li><b>Conclusion:</b> Summarizes findings effectively and provides recommendations for waste management strategies.</li></ul> <p>The structure is <b>appropriate for a scholarly paper</b>.</p>	OK
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The manuscript includes <b>relevant and diverse references</b>, covering both regional and international studies.</li><li>Some <b>references are older</b> (e.g., early 2000s); including more recent studies (past 5-7 years) on <b>waste management innovations</b> would enhance the manuscript's relevance.</li></ul>	<p>Some references may have been replaced</p> <p>Thanks for the comments</p>

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality is suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	