SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Applied Science & Technology**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**1. The Author(s) had studied and presented an original work on the topical issue of waste management.** **2. Based on the contents, I like to suggest a slight modification of the title to read "Assessing the fertilizer utilization potential of municipal solid wastes in Akosombo, Ghana".** **3. The objective of the paper should stand out as a separate paragraph at the close of "Introduction" aspect.**	
Minor REVISION comments	1. In the Abstract, it was stated in 3rd to the last line that the C/N ratio falls within the "respective range", what is the range?, and given by which Standard? Am of the opinion that these should be stated here in the Abstract for clarity. 2. In section 3.1, paragraph 1, the phrase "higher proportion" is relative. How high? Figures should be mentioned here. 3. Table 4 shows the results obtained during the wet month whereas the research was also conducted during the dry month of December according to the Author(s), where is the Table reporting the results of the dry month?	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	1. The manuscript should be checked all-through for spelling mistakes, a conspicuous one is the Symposium wrongly spelt in the listed Reference number [15] on page 8. 2. General formatting and re-arrangements should be done, like the separation of the titles of Plates 1 and 2, the last 2 sentences on page 3 were disjointed, etc	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer