SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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	The paper is likely to be publishable as a technical note, but requires clarification, rewriting, reorganization and more detailed explanations, etc. As a reviewer, I summarize my comments below: 1. The manuscript describes "An Assessment the Solid Waste Composition and Management in Agbor and its implication on human health" but the case and methodology were not typical and could not provide the valuable national and international reference of the subject for other cities. Please compare the datas with similar/different studies. 2. There are many equivalent studies as field and research methodology. 3. It is not explicitly stated in the abstract or material and method section which characteristics of the stations are determined. There is no explanation as to what the stations are based on. 4. The data obtained are presented solely in the discussion section, but no recommendations have been made regarding the data. It had to be a conclusion part of the manuscript. This section should be developed. 5. Since the study data contains only monitoring data, no technical advice is included in the conclusion section. Conclusion is insufficient in this sense. 6. The solid waste management system includes the collection and transport of wastes and also their final disposal from the storage of waste. However, only the disposal of waste is mentioned in the text for solid waste management. "Descriptive Statistics for Solid Waste Management on Malaria Cases" This expression is incorrect. Disposal is not only management of the solid wastes. 7. Somewhere in the text, medical wastes are mentioned. This is an important issue in itself. Text is quite confused. 8. The study is a study that contains fairly general review data.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Oylum GOKKURT BAKİ***
Department, University & Country	***Sinop University, Turkey***