



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_24126
Title of the Manuscript:	GLOBAL WARMING POTENTIALS OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE DUMPSITE IN CALABAR METROPOLIS, CROSS RIVER STATE
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 <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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This paper presents an overview of the important concepts related to global warming potentials solid waste dumpsite. The text is easy to follow, the overall manuscript is defensible, and the writing is generally clear. The title brief identify clear the paper and the ABSTRACT indicates the main topics and results.</p> <p>In my opinion, before it can be accepted for publication I recommend major revisions both to content and also to the writing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The introduction is not motivating - The methodology has been published elsewhere. What is new and unique in that paper? - Please check the manuscript carefully for the correction errors on : punctuation errors, some unclear sentences, - Figures 1, is Not clear - You should keep the following rules: Each table and each figure have to be self understandable. The reader should get a first impression of the relevance of a contribution only by studying the tables and figures, and without reading the paper sections (W.M, MOQ???). - The results are badly written - Conclusion is poor, it should more focus on results. Please, DO so. Cohesiveness of paper: 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the conclusions must adequately tie together the other elements of the paper such as theory, data and critical perspectives.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	<i>Cadi Ayyad University, Morocco</i>