



Paper: “National Solid Waste Management Programs and Policies in the City of Bujumbura”

Submitted: 22 September 2025

Accepted: 23 January 2026

Published: 31 January 2026

Corresponding Author: Emmanuel Ngabirano

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n2p89

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Benard O. Ojwang
Maseno University, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: BENARD O OJWANG	
University/Country: Maseno University, Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 17/11/2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/11/2025
Manuscript Title: Socio-anthropological Analysis of the National Solid Waste Management Program in the City of Bujumbura	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1023/25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: YES	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. (Socio-anthropological analyses examine human society and culture by studying social structures, cultural practices, and the behavior of people within their social and cultural contexts. The methodology in this article makes it qualify for systematic review of trends in the National Solid Waste Management Program in the City of Bujumbura)	1
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results. (Objectives are not clear in the abstract and in the body. Methodology in abstract is different from the one under methods in the body. Results cannot be correlated with the objectives)	2
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. (Some sentences are in future tense especially in the introduction part)	4

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
(The methods of data collection are not clear. If the authors have particular policies which they wanted to analyse, then search engines such as Google scholar, Free Full PDF and Microsoft Academic Search are not necessary. This therefore brings to the question whether this is a systematic review or a Socio-anthropological analyses)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
(Results cannot be clear when objectives and methods are not clear)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
(Conclusions cannot be clear when objectives and methods are not clear)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
(Most of the articles listed in the reference section are not cited in the main article)	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): Articulate clear objectives which are aligned to the title of the article then outline the methods for reaching the objectives.