

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_124155
Title of the Manuscript:	CHARACTERIZATION OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE IN ENUGU METROPOLIS FOR OPTIMAL MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES
Type of the Article	Original

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.	<div>1. It presents composition and generation of MSW in Enugu Metropolis, Nigeria, with methodologies such as material-based classification and moisture content determination.</div> <div>2. The study's emphasis on the necessity of formal composting and recycling facilities aligns with sustainable waste management practices and addresses the gaps in the current system.</div> <div>3. It needs to add more detailed discussions on the potential challenges and solutions for implementing the suggested strategies in the local context.</div>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Characterization and Management Strategies for Municipal Solid Waste in Enugu Metropolis: Insights for Sustainable Waste Solutions	
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.	<div>1. The abstract can present key results, such as the exact percentage of biodegradable versus non-biodegradable waste and the range of per capita waste generation.</div>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	<div>1. The study includes the collection and analysis of 300 waste samples across different socioeconomic strata, which provides a detailed and representative understanding of the waste composition in Enugu Metropolis.</div> <div>2. The use of traditional and material-based classification methods, along with moisture content determination, shows that the data is reliable and accurately reflects the waste profile of the area.</div>	
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		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ashish Khanal
Department, University & Country	TERI School of Advanced Studies, India