

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	MS_AJARR_87606
Title of the Manuscript:	Solid Wastes: Characteristics, Composition and Adverse Effects on Environment and Public Health
Type of the Article	Review 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:

(<https://www.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy>)

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	The paper as a whole need to be rewritten. At most it should not be more than 15 pages. It should appear more as a review than the way it appeared. As it is now, it can best be taken for lecture note without any digest to bring out meaningful findings in the review.	It is a review paper and all the necessary and relevant topics are being covered.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The paper appeared good and can be corrected to a standard form with little efforts.	Revision has been made as per the comments/remarks mentioned.

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> YES. <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The write up does not reflect the title- There should not be less than 35 cited references in a review paper, taking in to consideration: Only in text cited material can be listed in the referencing.- There appeared to no concrete conclusion to this work, possibly because of the disjointed points' presentation in the whole work.- Every of digest in the paper should take form of a review, this way it will appear more as a review paper.- Cited materials should not be older than 5 years, at most they should not exceed 6 years. This showed, you're your sources should not exceed 2017.	Again to mention that it is a review article and best of the latest references has been considered.