



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAERI_15558
Title of the Manuscript:	Potential of solid waste composting in the Gaza Strip- Palestine
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>)



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		
Minor REVISION comments	1. In the abstract, specifically in the 7th line, the statement "To be able to make a higher percentage possible" should read better as follows "to be able to avail a higher quantum" 2. In the abstract again, specifically from the ninth and tenth, the statement "the main barriers for market development....." should read: the main barriers to market development. 3. In the introduction, specifically in the third line, "with donors support" should read "with donor support" 4. The next line, ie 4th line "donkey carts and push carts" should read "donkey and push carts" 5. The 12th line in the introduction, "the currently applied central dump sites are....." should read better as "the current operational central dump sites are Jahr El Deek" 6. In page 2 specifically in the 9th line, The statement Gaza is the only area where fresh water has still an acceptable quality, though being a quotation from Abdelqader (2011), it should read as "Gaza is the only area where fresh water can still boast of an acceptable quality" 7. Page 2, 12th line, waste is dumped temporary should change to waste is dumped temporally 8. Page 2, next paragraph beginning on 15th line. The statement Primary collection of waste is done through containers located along the streets..... should read "Primary collection of waste is done through the use of containers located along the streets....." 9. In the 16th line "If collection is coming late" looks more like a	First I would like to thank you for your comments. I collected data about compost quality imported or produced locally and figures about solid waste composition in the Gaza Strip. Also data regarding agriculture land use and Gaza Population is collected. All data is reviewed and presented in the paper. Based on collected data, the paper is improved taking into consideration your comments mainly in discussion.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	direct translation from the author's local language and should be revised to read better as follows "if there is a delay in collection, it is noticed that people tend to burn the waste in containers to make room for more space" 10. Same page 2, within the 20th line, "have reached the end of their life cycles" should be put in quotes as done above or if not it should read "have become old and rickety which leads to high maintenance cost....." 11. Under discussion, ie quantities and types of organic waste, The first line should read "The total population in Gaza is approximately 1.7 million people who generate domestic waste amounting to 600,000tons 12. Still at the discussion section, in the 4th line , the statement "In 2040" should read "By 2040, the population figures are estimated to grow to 3.2 million(PCBS, 2013) which will result in 1.3million tons of waste....." 13. Further down in the 8th line, the sentence should read as follows: Based on the estimated domestic waste generation amount calculated for 2040, it will require a compost capacity of 200,000 tons/year in Gaza in the future. 14. In page 3, the first line should read "Furthermore, based on information from the ministry of Agriculture, that is, of should be changed to from 15. Once again that whole sentence contains lots of information with quotation of figures. One would expect that at the end of the said paragraph, the source of the information should be stated. Yes it is from the ministry of agriculture but from which official document/article/source? This must be stated. 16. In page 3, under the heading compost market potential, in the 2nd line, the sentence should read high waste 'generation' and not 'production' 17. Under the heading current market conditions, the second paragraph, the construction is made up of extremely short sentences which could have been put in one sentence as follows. " In Gaza, the compost is sold for 10NIS/20 kg bag	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(about 3 USD/20kg bag which corresponds to 500 NIS/ton, while in the West Bank, about 50 USD/ton is being paid (Mahamid and Thawaba, 2010) 18. In page 4, the beginning sentence, the poor economical situation should read the poor economic situation and before the table, the sentence should read an overview of this comparison between costs and profits is given in table 1. and not in the table 1. Please delete the 19. Below, the table, precisely in the 19th line, the word party be changed to partly and in the 24th line, the sentence “the marketing potential may be enlarged”, the word “enlarged” should change to “enhanced”. 20. In the next paragraph just following, compost markets are very sensitive to the quality of the compost. not sensitive for. 21. Page 5, in the 5th line, sentence should read: the quality of the compost is therefore of utmost importance. Please delete the before utmost 22. 13th line, waste producers should change to waste generators. Same applies to the two bulleted sentences immediately below. Citizens and organizations producing waste should change to citizens and organizations generating waste. 23. Page 5, in the 18th line, the sentence “this could than cause....” should read this could then cause 24. In page 6, in my candid opinion, i think the first bulleted sentence should read “Combining separate collection with an increased waste collection frequency will result in less nuisance created around houses and streets through inappropriate waste disposal modes” 25. Immediately after the bulleted sentences in page 6, the 2nd sentence, “Elaboration of a market development programme should start with engaging.....” should rather read “An elaborate market development programme should start with engaging.....’ 26. Proceeding down to the 10th line in that same paragraph, the sentence should read “with the private sector on one hand to	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	develop a good compost market” that is, the to before the on should be deleted. 27. On page 6, under the heading optimal composting technology. The 2nd paragraph, it is inappropriate to begin a sentence with because. Consider reviewing the sentence to read as follows: “Due to the open air conditions, it is recommended that the composting facilities be enlarged as the current ones are too small and this has the potential of causing problems in the process control during very hot seasons (periods) in the year”. 28. In page 7, under the heading total amount of organic material to be composted specifically in the 12th line. The sentence should read as follows: Based on the projected domestic waste quantum calculated for 2040. Again in the 20th line, the word amount should be replaced with quantity. Hence that sentence should read “The quantity of domestic waste going to the landfill will however be reduced..... 29. Under conclusions and recommendations, 2nd paragraph in the 10th line, The mechanical separated fraction should read the mechanically separated fraction. Again in the last paragraph to this study, the main barriers for market development should read the main barriers to 30. In the reference section, specifically the 4th reference. The full meaning of PCBS should be stated. Again in the reference section, there is lack of consistency in the fact that some of the years of authorship are in brackets while others are not. References numbered 6, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15 have their years of authorship in brackets while the rest are not. The author(s) of this manuscript need to be consistent on this and be in conformity with what this journal’s authorship regulations with regard to referencing. That is, years are all in brackets or all are without brackets.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		