



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_46618
Title of the Manuscript:	ENERGY RECOVERY POTENTIAL AND MANAGEMENT OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE IN NIGERIA: A REVIEW
Type of the Article	Review Paper

**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 Comments0**

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The author show the different states' waste management situation in Nigeria from different literature in different year, but the data is from different year. Form the principle, the author cannot compare the gap. In addition, the author need to compare the situation and describe why the situation and institution are different in different state government.</li> <li>2. If the author cited the other researches paper before or in the sentence, not in the end of sentence, you must show the author's name. Now, author's cited behaviour isn't adjusted to international traditions. For example,"[3] defined solid waste as a material that is no longer valuable which is not intended to be discharged through a pipe." should changed "Ajani(2008) defined solid waste as a material that is no longer valuable which is not intended to be discharged through a pipe". Please the author changed all paper cited information.</li> <li>3. Which year the result are from in Table 2?</li> <li>4. The author should compare the laws and regulations using the table, and describe the change among different laws and regulations.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Thank you very much sir for this observation. This was what we attempted in section 2.1 through to section 2.6, we gave vivid information on each state based on available literatures. Thus each section of waste management was highlighted on a state-by-state basis not only to enhance comparison across board but to enhance spotting variations.</li> <li>2) Noted Sir. The corrections have been effected throughout the body of the work.</li> <li>3) Noted sir. The correction has been effected. (Check footnote of Table 2)</li> <li>4) Noted sir. The correction has been effected. Check section 4.1 to 4.6 (Rather than the use of table, the authors opted to reword and reorganize the subsections of section 4 to reflect the progression of the Nation's environmental laws from when it was first giving priority till present. This aids the easy identification of similarities and differences among the stated regulations)</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In this sentence, "Only 14 kg (14.24%) in 2001 and just 13.06% of 268 kg in 2013 were recycled [8]. " , the author didn't show the all weight in 2001. Please add it.</li> </ol>	Noted Sir. The correction has been effected. (Check section 1, paragraph 3)
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	