



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_50683
Title of the Manuscript:	OPEN LANDFILL BIOMEDICAL WASTES DISPOSAL SYSTEM AND IMPACT ON HEALTH AS PERCEIVED BY HEALTH WORKERS
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The introduction part is too lengthy, and it should be shortened. This is probably due to the missing of literature review section and it is suggested to add that in this research.</p> <p>Research methodology, research findings, discussion and recommendation are seeming too brief explained, further elaboration needed.</p> <p>Unclear research gaps. The researcher is advised to highlight the gaps in this research.</p> <p>The content of introduction is not well organized, repetitive occur.</p>	Corrected as suggested
Minor REVISION comments	Please check again the punctuation.	
Optional/General comments	The researcher is believed to have enough knowledge on his/her research topic, research problems and objectives was clearly stated. However, the researcher should also emphasize on the research gaps and contributions to the body of knowledge of this research.	



SDI 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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	