



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_10631
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the Potential of Solid Waste for Fertilizer Utilisation in the Akosombo Township, Ghana
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)



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 The Paper requires MAJOR revision as listed in the column for Reviewer's comment	1. MATERIALS AND METHODS The Characterisation method applied did not meet standard procedure. There are two procedure commonly applied in solid waste characterisation process. • Material flow approach • Site-specific-study approach. The site-specific-study approach was applied in the work reported in this article. the site-specific-study approach requires the following: - Determination of the total population of the sampling area (total number of site, sample unit or source of solid waste) - Determination of sample size - Selecting a representative sample - Collection and analysis of samples However the review of this article revealed the following: ➤ The population (total number of sites/sources) was not determined ➤ Only 12 sample sites were randomly	Changes have been effected in the manuscripts regarding the reviewer comments. Results and Discussion The unit have been provided. CONCLUSION Changes have been effected in the manuscripts REFERENCES Corrections have been made and highlighted to that effect.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	selected and used. ➤ Sample sites such as Drains were applied. During the wet season the drains are not reliable sample site for solid waste characterisation because during the wet/raining season runoff water is expected to carry some components of the solid waste away from the site and the sample collected will not be a fair representation of the waste from the source. 2. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION The results were poorly presented as follows: ➤ The column of Table 1 has no unit. The figures presented are therefore difficult to comprehend. ➤ Miscellaneous and other waste was presented in table 1. What constitute miscellaneous and other waste? ➤ In table two volatile matters was presented. What component of municipal solid waste is volatile? 3. CONCLUSION Poor presentation of Recommendation under conclusion. 4. REFERENCES	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	References were not properly cited as follows: ➤ On page 3 - "Solid Waste characterization methods used was in accordance with US [17, 18]." ➤ One page 4 - Fermentable wastes are typified by crop and market debris [21]. ➤ One page 5 - The study generally recorded organic matter values ranging between 60% to 100 % with a mean of 70% which is consistent with the earlier estimation by [23]. ➤ One Page 6 - According to [18]. ➤ In table 3 - reference is indicated as a column.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	If any ethical issue, please clarify	No ethical issues
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article needs major revision. The solid waste characterisation need to be properly carried out. However the article dealt on a very important topic and with major revision may be publishable after further review.	