

WASTE MANAGEMENT & RESEARCH



Newsletter 2016 #1



Welcome to the first WM&R newsletter for 2016!

In this newsletter we've provided a snapshot of how the journal is doing and a review of 2015, journal news, an interview with our WM&R Best Paper award winners and an ISWA update.

Best wishes,

Louisa Strain, *Commissioning Editor*

WM&R continues to be in a healthy state with continued growth in terms of submissions, accepted papers and usage. We want to try to encourage high quality submissions and would welcome papers from the USA in particular.

WM&R 2015 highlights

- Received over 840 submissions
- Published papers from 76 different countries worldwide
- Excellent first decision times – average first decision within 60 days
- Acceptance to online publication in an average of 25 days

Top reasons to publish in WM&R:

- The official journal of the International Solid Waste Association (ISWA)
- Dissemination of research findings through international channels via ISWA and SAGE
- Articles rigorously peer reviewed by experts in the field
- Excellent first decision times – average first decision within 60 days
- Fast speed to publication – acceptance to online publication in an average of 25 days
- Opportunities for article promotion via Editor's Choice index, WM&R social media and via the ISWA newsletters
- Indexed in all major databases: Web of Science and Scopus with respectable rankings

Please remember to spread the word and encourage your colleagues and associates to publish in WM&R and do, of course, submit papers yourselves. Our average receipt to first decision times for full peer review is 60 days!

WASTE MANAGEMENT & RESEARCH



Newsletter 2016 #1

Most downloaded articles 2015 (published in last 2 years):

1. Extended producers' responsibility schemes for used beverage carton recycling by *P. Agamuthu and C. Visvanathan (editorial)*
2. An in-depth literature review of the waste electrical and electronic equipment context: Trends and evolution by *V Perez-Belis et al (review article)*
3. Developing models for the prediction of hospital healthcare waste generation rate by *Esubalew Tesfahun et al (original article)*
4. Money doesn't grow on trees: Municipal solid waste management programmes must be effective, efficient, and affordable by *David E Ross (editorial)*
5. Progress and challenges to the global waste management system by *Jagdeep Singh et al (original article)*
6. The challenge of electrical waste (e-waste) management in developing countries by *Jagdeep Singh et al (original article)*
7. Moving from recycling to waste prevention: A review of barriers and enablers by *Andreas Bartl (review article)*
8. Municipal solid waste management using Geographical Information System aided methods: A mini review by *D Khan et al*
9. Landfilling in developing countries by *P. Agamuthu (editorial)*
10. The use of multi-criteria decision analysis to tackle waste management problems: a literature review by *Charisios Achillas et al (review article)*

The official journal of
 **ISWA** ISWA News
International Solid Waste Association

Check out ISWA's latest publications:

[Practical Sourcebook on Mercury Waste Storage and Disposal](#)

[Global Waste Management Outlook](#)

[Final Reports of the Task Force on Resource Management](#)

Plans are in the making for the ISWA World Congress 2016 in Novi Sad, Serbia. As usual, WM&R will be publishing a special issue of the conference highlights. Click [here](#) to register for the World Congress.

The WM&R Award for Excellent Reviewer in 2015 was awarded to Dr Sigrid Kusch, and the following reviewers have been each presented with a WM&R award for Recommended Reviewer: Prof. Alfons Buekens, Dr Alberto Bezama, Dr Fabrizio Di Gregorio and Dr Xavier Font. Both SAGE and the Editorial Office would like particularly to thank all the reviewers, who regularly review papers submitted to the journal. Thank you all for your support throughout 2015, and we hope that you will continue to support us on into 2016.

David C Wilson, Ljiljana Rodic, Anne Scheinberg, Costas A Velis, and Graham Alabaster were awarded the WM&R Best Paper Award for their paper: **Comparative analysis of solid waste management in 20 cities** published in WM&R in 2012. This paper was selected by the WM&R Editorial Team as having contributed to the current Impact Factor, based on citations and quality of research. The prize is selected by the WM&R Editorial team and awarded at the ISWA World Congress. As a result of David et al's suggestions, we have now made the prize winning paper freely available to download and we will be creating a "prize winning papers" collection on the WM&R website.

We've interviewed David Wilson on behalf of all the authors and I am sure you'll find the responses interesting:



Call for a new Editorial Group member!

We have a vacancy for a new Editorial Group member of WM&R, with an expertise in Hazardous Waste including eWaste. We are welcoming applications and recommendations. For more information click [here](#).

1) This was an ambitious paper - can you tell us how you came to write it?

UN-Habitat chose to focus its Third Global Report on Water and Sanitation in the World's Cities on Solid Waste Management in the World's Cities. A group of more than 30 professionals from all around the world were brought together and asked to prepare a definitive guidance document. But at our first meeting we identified one of the major issues as the lack of a good evidence base allowing cities to be compared on a consistent basis. So the project leader, Anne Scheinberg, convinced UN-Habitat that we should go for real data from 20 cities. Following publication of the Habitat book, the three lead authors carried on analysing the data and brought in Costas Velis to help in particular with the statistical analysis.

2) You present a lot of data. How did you establish the reliability of the data and its comparability between 20 very different cities?

Historically, data quality and availability has been very poor in the solid waste sector, so we put a lot of effort into this. We sought data on the whole of a city's solid waste management system - looking not only at the formal system but also at any informal activities, and not only at the physical components but also at the governance aspects. We collected data as close to the field as possible, using city profilers familiar with the city and carefully documenting the process. We collated existing data sources, and interviewed key stakeholders, both to fill in the gaps and to estimate the qualitative information required to assess many of the indicators. The methodological approach emphasised traceability and triangulation, because absolute reliability wasn't within reach. Using a material flow diagram was critical to ensuring that the physical data were complete and consistent and that all the flows balanced. One of the authors (Ljiljana Rodic) acted as research coordinator, reviewing the draft city profiles and ensuring a common interpretation between the city profilers - a necessary step to ensure comparability.

3) Have you followed up on this work since this paper was published in March 2012?

Yes. Some initial work focused on applying the same methodology to other cities - leading for example to WM&R papers on **Bahrain** (DOI: 10.1177/0734242X12441962), **Bishkek** (DOI: 10.1177/0734242X13499813) and **Lahore** (DOI: 10.1177/0734242X14545373). The methodology has been further developed into the 'Wasteaware' benchmark indicators (DOI: 10.1016/j.wasman.2014.10.006). These have now been applied to more than 40 cities, and a further, more statistical comparative paper is in preparation.

Some of the authors have also followed up in other WM&R papers on particular aspects addressed in the original paper. For example, **Costas Velis and David Wilson** presented a framework for integration of the informal and formal solid waste sectors (DOI: 10.1177/0734242X12454934), while **Ljiljana Rodic** has looked at the potential for nutrients recovery from municipal waste based on the benchmark indicators (doi:10.1016/j.wasman.2015.07.033). **Anne Scheinberg** used data from five of the original 20 cities to propose recycling frameworks to analyse inclusive recycling performance (DOI: 10.1177/0734242X15600050).

4) What advice would you give to readers interested in evaluating the performance of a city's solid waste management system?

Go for it! Have courage, get into the field, and talk to all the stakeholders.

We believe that the 'Wasteaware' benchmark indicators provide a consistent basis for evaluating performance of a city's solid waste management system, facilitating benchmarking against similar cities and quickly focusing attention on the key aspects requiring further improvement. A User Manual was published as Supplementary Material alongside the paper cited above, and we are seeking support to compile a database of all city profiles prepared using the indicators. So, PLEASE use the Wasteaware indicators, and seek advice from, and/or provide a copy of your results to, David Wilson (waste@davidcwilson.com) or Costas Velis (c.velis@leeds.ac.uk), to feed into future comparative papers.

5) What is the one most important message that you would like WM&R readers to take from this paper?

Choosing just one message is challenging! I have asked my co-authors, and we have each focused on a different message. Mine is that sustainable solutions require a focus on the governance aspects alongside the physical components. Ljiljana Rodic's is that an exchange between the scientific community and waste practitioners, both formal and informal, may take professional courage (on both sides!) but it can be very rewarding and fruitful for improving the performance of SWM systems. Anne Scheinberg's is that building a sanitary landfill is a bad choice if there is no chance of paying the operating costs. While Costas Velis's is that we need you to use the Wasteaware indicators, so that we build up the database on more cities, so as to be able to do proper statistical analysis of the performance of SWM systems around the world.

6) Were you surprised to have been awarded the WM&R Best Paper Award for 2015?

As this is the first time that such an award has been made, it came as a complete surprise. As the criterion is based on the most citations, it is a very satisfying award to win!

7) What did you like the most about the promotion your paper has received as a result of the Award? How do you think your paper could be made more visible?

The most important part of winning a publication award is generally that the publisher makes the paper free to download - which for a paper aimed at least in part at developing countries is very important, as it would make the paper visible and available to a much wider audience.

We would also suggest that WM&R creates a dedicated page on the website for each award winning paper - again, this would significantly improve visibility.