|  |
| --- |
|  |
| Book Name: | **Innovative Solutions: A Systematic Approach Towards Sustainable Future** |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_BPR\_3724.27** |
| Title of the Manuscript:  | **A Survey on Recycling Methods in Waste Management** |
| Type of the Article | **Complete Book Chapter** |

|  |
| --- |
| 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 offers a timely exploration of the integration of digital technologies in recycling waste management, which is crucial for addressing global waste problems and sustainability goals. The paper provides a well-rounded review of methods such as machine learning, blockchain, and IoT applications in waste management, which have the potential to revolutionize the sector. By focusing on emerging technologies, the manuscript fills an important gap in the literature, offering insights that can drive future research and innovations in this field. The topic is not only relevant to environmental scientists but also provides a broader interdisciplinary contribution to technology, policy, and sustainability. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title is mostly suitable as it clearly reflects the main theme of the manuscript, which is recycling methods and their integration with advanced technologies. However, it could be made more specific by mentioning the technologies or systems discussed in the paper. For example, an alternative title could be: "Integration of IoT, Blockchain, and Machine Learning in Recycling: A Survey of Waste Management Innovations" |  |
| 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 in its general description of the paper’s aims and findings. It mentions the key technologies, such as IoT and machine learning, and their applications in recycling. However, a slight improvement could be made by specifying how these technologies are integrated within current waste management systems and the specific impacts they might have on efficiency and sustainability. Additionally, a brief mention of the research gap or the need for further research could make the abstract more aligned with the paper’s scientific contribution. |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | The structure of the manuscript is appropriate, with a logical flow from introduction, literature review, findings, discussion, and conclusion. The subsections break down the complex topic into manageable components, making it easy to follow. However, the subsections could be improved with clearer delineations between each technology and their specific contributions to waste management. Some sections might benefit from additional subheadings for greater clarity, particularly in the discussion section. |  |
| **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.** | The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, as it thoroughly reviews existing technologies and their potential to enhance recycling practices. The integration of IoT, blockchain, and machine learning with recycling methods has been discussed in the context of recent studies, indicating that the manuscript is grounded in up-to-date scientific literature. Moreover, the findings align with the current technological trends in waste management, supporting the validity of the paper's claims. The scientific accuracy is strengthened by referencing credible sources and industry examples |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | The references are generally sufficient and cover a range of studies in recycling and digital technologies. However, the manuscript could benefit from including more recent references that discuss the latest advancements in digital waste management, particularly studies published within the last 2-3 years. In addition, including sources on governmental policies supporting digital recycling initiatives could provide a more holistic view of the subject. |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language and English quality are generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are minor improvements that could be made in sentence structure and clarity. Some parts of the manuscript are a bit dense, and simplifying the language in those areas could make the content more accessible. Additionally, some technical terms could be explained more clearly for a broader audience, especially those not immediately familiar with the subject. |  |
| Optional/General comments | **The manuscript is strong overall, but the abstract could be more specific, and the structure could be slightly improved. Additionally, some refinement in language and further references to real-world case studies would elevate the work.** |  |
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|  | **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)* |  |
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