Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_130441
Title of the Manuscript:	Case Study of Operational Implementation of Fast Moving Consumer Goods Product Waste Management
Type of the Article	Conceptual

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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: <u>https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/</u> Benefits for Reviewers: <u>https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers</u>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (F part in the manuscript. his/her feedback here)
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 topic that this paper tries to discuss is of huge importance since it deals with responsible and sustainable handling of Market return FMCG products. This paper can help in spreading awareness about sustainable ways of handling market return products as well as create business opportunities for businesses like Waste to energy, waste processing companies etc. This paper can act as a base for further research and development for a practical business model which involves FMCG companies,	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	 waste management companies and consumers and prove to be a win-win solution for all. The title can be better if keywords are used in it. Like- 1) Case Study on Sustainable Waste Management of FMCG Market returns 2) Conceptual Framework for sustainably handling market return FMCG products- A Case Study 	
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 English of the abstract is raw and can be polished for better understanding. Following sentence needs to be corrected- <i>This study aims to analyze how waste management companies can handle FMCG products that are returned to from the market (market returns).</i> Below sentences are repeated in different words. It needs to be corrected- <i>The method used is qualitative descriptive, systematically and thoroughly illustrating waste management that can be utilized, for instance, as animal feed. The purpose of the study was to determine how Waste Management Companies can manage Market Return products. The research method used is descriptive qualitative to describe clearly, systematically and accurately how to manage fixed waste into waste that can be used as animal feed.</i> 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is correct. The only issue is that the flow diagrams and data are in Indonesian language which restricts its understanding to readers from different regions. Those should be re-constructed in English for better understanding at global level.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript lacks in text or footnote referencing which makes it difficult to understand which part of it is quoted and which part is original work. Some definitions don't even have any referencing, for example the definition of Interviews. Moreover, the references section isn't written in APA format which is a global standard of writing references. Kotler and Keller (2009) and Setiadi (2010) are mentioned in the main body of the manuscript but are not included in the "References" section.	

(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that ipt. It is mandatory that authors should write re)

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English is an area where it needs improvement. Very raw form of English is employed and there are certain sentences which don't even convey the exact meaning it is supposed to. It gets difficult to understand sometimes. The English definitely needs refinement.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	 There are some other observations in the manuscript which should be brought to attention- 1) The Methodology- Since the author employed qualitative approach and have mentioned 6 respondents were interviewed. It lacks the questionnaire and how these responses were analyzed. What method the author used to analyze and draw inference from the data collected. 2) The following keywords are not relevant to the paper- <i>Quality Control, Animal Feed Repurposing</i> 3) The data given in the "Specific Hypothesis" section should be backed with some reference or calculation. 4) I feel in the main hypothesis section, the first 2 points should be vice-versa. 	
	 Implementation of effective FMCG waste management can reduce environmental impacts. The use of environmentally friendly technology in FMCG waste management can increase operational efficiency. 	
	 Should be- 1. Implementation of effective FMCG waste management can increase operational efficiency. 2. The use of environmentally friendly technology in FMCG waste management can reduce environmental impacts. 	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed w highlight that part in the manusc his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Akram Azaz
Department, University & Country	Tezpur University, India

d with reviewer, correct the manuscript and uscript. It is mandatory that authors should write