

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2018

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.

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:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 1/4/2019	Date Review Report Submitted: 1/10/2019
Manuscript Title: Dimensions of Inequality in Urban and Rural Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Services in Sub-Saharan Africa	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: NO	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the published version of the paper: NO	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>ease insert your comments)</i>	

There a few minor editorial corrections that need to be made; for example; page 2, paragraph 2, line 6.....there should be a comma in the sentence, respectively.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(insert your comments)</i> The paper is very well written	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This is a very well written paper, and one that reflects considerable thought on the part of the author. I would offer two minor suggestions, one that will simply enhance the presentation of the work. The other may alter the main conclusions a bit. First, I would encourage the author to include a reference map of Africa, highlighting the region (SSA) under focus. There is no commonly agreed upon definition of what African nations comprise Sub-Saharan Africa (and some of the countries may only be partially included in the region, possessing territory that lies outside SSA) . I actually think that the author should consider extending the study in the future. It would seem likely that some of the data presented exhibits some interesting geographical patterns. Obviously that is not the purpose of this specific paper, but it would be easy for the author to write a follow-up using the same data. Regardless, I do think this particular paper would benefit from a reference map.

Secondly, I think the author should include data pertaining to the actual growth rates of urban and rural areas, respectively. They should also provide overall growth rates of the specific countries. The author

mentions that rates of rural-to-urban migration may explain why the availability of WASH services appeared to decline in the urban portions of certain countries. For example, the lack of WASH services in a rural area may actually be one reason rural inhabitants would migrate to an urban area. Accordingly, the access to WASH services may increase overtime in the absolute sense, but the percentages of people who lack access may appear to increase simply because of the influx of rural migrants. Or maybe not? Regardless, given the author reports raw percentages and compares them over time, it is essential that they report the changes that have occurred in the urban/rural populations. Otherwise, the data being interpreted may be very skewed.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

