Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEE_126664**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Medical Waste Management System in Health Institutes within the Rajshahi City Corporation, Rajshahi, Bangladesh**
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/
Benefits for Reviewers: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it highlights the critical issue of medical waste management in Rajshahi City Corporation, Bangladesh. Effective waste management is crucial for minimizing public health risks, environmental pollution, and the spread of infectious diseases. The study provides valuable insights into current practices and identifies key challenges such as manpower shortages, lack of technical expertise, and inadequate investment. I appreciate the manuscript because it not only sheds light on the present shortcomings but also proposes actionable recommendations for improving awareness and practices in waste collection and disposal, which could serve as a foundation for policy reforms and sustainable waste management solutions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	**Yes, seems Good**	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is fairly comprehensive, as it covers the study's purpose, methods, findings, and key recommendations. However, there are a few areas where it could be strengthened: 1. **Objectives**: The abstract could briefly clarify specific research objectives beyond assessing waste disposal, such as exploring the environmental or health impacts of current waste practices. 2. **Methodology Details**: While data collection methods are mentioned, adding specific details—such as the sample size or how hospitals and diagnostic centers were selected—would enhance transparency and strengthen the study's rigor. 3. **Key Findings**: The abstract could benefit from a clearer breakdown of the waste types identified. Mentioning categories beyond "infectious" and "non-infectious" (if applicable) would provide readers with a more nuanced understanding. 4. **Recommendations**: The recommendations are important, but expanding on these in the abstract with concrete examples (e.g., types of training, proposed policies) would better reflect the practical implications of the study's findings.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**Yes seem good**	

Review Form 3

Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound, as it systematically examines a critical aspect of healthcare infrastructure—medical waste management—in a structured and data-driven way. The study utilizes a mixed-methods approach, incorporating quantitative data from questionnaires and site visits, as well as qualitative insights from in-depth interviews, which enhances the reliability of the findings. Additionally, the use of specific metrics, such as daily waste generation and waste type proportions, provides a clear, measurable perspective on the problem. The manuscript's scientific rigor is further strengthened by its practical recommendations for improving waste management, which are based on observed gaps in manpower, knowledge, and resources. These factors collectively demonstrate the manuscript's methodological integrity and relevance to the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	**Yess it is sufficient and recent**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, as it conveys the main ideas and findings in a clear and direct manner. However, certain phrases and sections could benefit from minor revisions to enhance readability and precision. For example, "the present research strongly recommends how to build awareness" could be rephrased to "the study strongly recommends strategies for building awareness."	
Optional/General comments	An additional suggestion would be to include a brief discussion in the manuscript regarding the potential impact of improved waste management on public health and environmental sustainability. This would help contextualize the study's importance for readers who may not be directly familiar with the topic. Furthermore, the study could benefit from comparisons with waste management practices in similar urban areas or countries, providing a broader perspective on where Rajshahi City stands relative to global standards. Including a limitations section would also strengthen the manuscript by acknowledging any constraints in data collection or analysis, adding transparency and aiding future research efforts. • Strengths: The manuscript tackles an important and relevant topic, utilizes a mixed-methods approach, and provides practical recommendations, all of which enhance its scientific and practical value. • Areas for Improvement: Minor adjustments are needed in language clarity, and the abstract could benefit from additional details for a stronger presentation. Including a limitations section and contextual comparisons would also improve its scholarly depth. Here's a breakdown of the reasoning:	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Atif Munir**
Department, University & Country	**Fatima Memorial College of Medicine & Dentistry, Pakistan**