

Journal Name:	Journal of Global Research in Education and Social Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOGRESS_12599
Title of the Manuscript:	Quality of Medical Waste Management to Enhance Public Trust in Healthcare Facilities
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: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The topic is important for the scientific community. Waste management especially in Medical will provide much comfort to the patient and build trust among the people. So the topic is good.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The author should think more about the title. "Quality of Medical Waste Management ", this part of the title misled me initially. "Quality Waste Management in Medical" or "Improving Medical Waste Management System" or others would be a better choice.	
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 is okay. The findings of the research should be more clear in the abstract.	
Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient. Some references are in 2006, 2007. I think such old references should be avoided.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, English is okay.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The topic is good. The Survey method should be elaborated in the script and there should be a comparison with other studies with the proposed research and result.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arman Mohammad Nakib
Department, University & Country	Nanjing University of Information Science & Technology, China