



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_45181
Title of the Manuscript:	Composition, Generation and Management Method of Municipal Solid Waste in the case of Addis Ababa city, Central Ethiopia: A review
Type of the Article	Review

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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title 2. Abstract 3. Text Structure 4. Data to checked 5. Figures 6. Tables 7. References 8. Conclusion 	<p>1. The title is too long and repetitive. Needs to be reduced to a maximum of 12 words to facilitate your understanding. The concept of waste management includes waste generation and composition.</p> <p>2. The abstract is too long and does not present the methodology of the review.</p> <p>3. The text is too long. The description of the study area can be shortened. Example: lines 105 to 109 and line 133 to 141 are not important information and can be remove.</p> <p>3.1. Usually studies and research on waste management the generation and composition are presented before the system of collection, transportation and final disposal. It is important for the reader to know these data first. I suggest a review of the text structure starting with the generation and composition description before the collection, transportation and waste final disposal</p> <p>3.2. I suggest place item 2.4.1. to the final disposal item and the quality of forecast in the City Plan that was not implemented.</p> <p>3.3. Line 394. Item 2.3. I suggest to change to Public Health problems</p> <p>4. Check the data 4.1. Line 123- 124 4.2. Lines 173 to 182- It is not clear who is paying the collection system, the residents or the government? 4.3. Lines 323 to 330- Verify - What has been proved to be true? 4.4. Table 7. In the title Title "from 2010- 2012", and in the source ABABA 2007. It is impossible.</p> <p>5. Reduce the number of figures and place them closer to the texts in which they are cited</p> <p>5.1. Remove Figure 5 because is only repeating the text 5.2. Remove Figure 6- is unnecessary and the data can be incorporated to the text. Lines 210-211 the figure does not match the text. 5.3. Figure 9- What does it mean "source: based on own review (2018)"?. May be organized by the authors? 5.4. Remove figures 10 and 11 because they are only repeating the text. If they are maintained it is necessary to analyze and discuss the figures. 5.5. Remove the word see in the quote of the figures. Correct- Example: (figure 1). 5.6. Remove parentheses of the sources references in the figures and tables.</p> <p>6. Table 6. What does it mean "source: based on own review (2018)"? May be organized by the authors?</p> <p>7. Check the order of the authors references throughout the text. From the older to the last.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<p>7.1 Line 63-64 - lack of year in the reference.</p> <p>7.2Line 195- 197 -The references of the figure is Amiga, 2002. Why the other reference?</p> <p>8. I suggest review the conclusion because I note that there was no recommendation.</p> <p>8.1. The conclusion can be shortened. Lines 455 to 459 are not important to the conclusions</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		I did not analyze English grammar because it is not my native language. I found some errors but I managed to read and understand the text well. However I suggest a language reviewer.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		The article is relevant but the authors needs to improve its quality	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Gina Rizpah Besen</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Sao Paulo, Brazil</i>