



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_48155
Title of the Manuscript:	An Assessment the Solid Waste Composition and Management in Agbor and its implication on human health
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	1. The concept of solid waste and occurrence of malaria and typhoid should be clearly stated for understanding of collected data, analysis and interpretation in this work. 2. The specific method of systematic sampling should be stated or explained. 3. The process of choosing respondents should be stated or explained.	We appreciate the reviewer's comments. The conceptual link between solid waste and the occurrence of malaria and typhoid has been re-examined through a review of literatures from other climes both within and outside the country of study. The steps taken in the systematic sampling is further explained in line with review comments
Minor REVISION comments	1. Correction on the Title of the paper. 2. The referencing in the text should be consistent. 3. Clear classification of secondary source of data should be corrected in the text. 4. Sampling points should be clarified. 5. The hypotheses statements should be stated appropriately. 6. Tables 2-5 should be under Socio-economic Characteristics of Respondents. 7. Tables not described in the text should be done. 8. Titles for tables and analysis framework should be specific and clearly related to the subject of this paper as indicated in the various comments in the main work. 9. The reference style in this paper should be improved.	We have responded to the comments here in the revised paper
Optional/General comments	Generally, it is a good effort and work, but the comments should be worked on before publication.	

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)	



SDI Review Form 1.6

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>