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| 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 addresses the critical issue of municipal solid waste management and its potential for energy recovery. By focusing on the conversion of waste to thermal energy, it aligns with contemporary sustainability goals and offers practical insights into innovative technologies. I appreciate the comprehensive approach taken in the manuscript, which combines a literature review, case studies, and expert consultations to provide a well-rounded perspective on the topic. The emphasis on environmental and social impacts adds depth to the discussion, making it relevant for policymakers and researchers alike.** | Thank you for your appreciation. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title "Solid Waste to Thermal Energy: A Sustainable Approach" is suitable as it clearly conveys the manuscript's focus on converting waste into energy through sustainable practices. However, an alternative title could be "Transforming Municipal Solid Waste into Sustainable Thermal Energy: Innovations and Impacts," which emphasizes the transformation aspect and highlights the innovative technologies discussed in the paper.** | The alternative suggestion is quite appropriate and has been used in the manuscript. |
| 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 comprehensive and effectively summarizes the key points of the manuscript. However, it could benefit from a brief mention of the specific thermal conversion technologies analyzed, such as gasification and pyrolysis, to provide readers with a clearer overview of the technological focus. Additionally, including a sentence on the implications of the findings for future waste management practices would enhance its relevance.** | Thank you for the appreciation as well as the suggestions. |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | **The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and facilitate a logical flow of information. Each section builds on the previous one, guiding the reader through the complexities of waste-to-energy conversion. The clear division into methodology, results, and discussion sections allows for effective navigation and comprehension of the material presented. Overall, the organization supports the manuscript's objectives well.** | Thank you |
| **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 demonstrates a high level of scientific correctness and technical soundness through its comprehensive review of the energy recovery methods from municipal solid waste (MSW). The rigorous methodology, which includes a thorough literature review, case study analysis, and expert consultation, ensures that the findings are well-supported by empirical evidence. Furthermore, the manuscript effectively discusses the nuances of different thermal conversion technologies, their efficiencies, and environmental impacts, which reflects a deep understanding of the subject matter. The integration of recent policies and directives, particularly from the European Union, further enhances its relevance and applicability to current waste management practices.** | Thank you for mentioning the scientific accuracy of the manuscript. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | **The references cited in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and relatively recent, covering a broad range of relevant studies and reports. However, to strengthen the manuscript further, I recommend including additional recent studies that focus on emerging technologies in waste-to-energy conversion, particularly those published in the last two years. For instance, articles from journals like "Waste Management" or "Renewable Energy" could provide valuable insights and data.** | The suggestions have been noted. |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | **The language and English quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, with clear and precise terminology used throughout. However, a few sections could benefit from minor grammatical adjustments and improved sentence structure for enhanced readability. Proofreading for consistency in terminology and clarity will strengthen the overall quality of the manuscript. Additionally, ensuring that all figures and tables are clearly referenced in the text will improve the flow of information.** | Thank you for the review. |
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