



**Paper: “Determination of Faecal Contamination of the Groundwater Resources from Tano Districts of Ghana”**

Corresponding Author: Frank Awuah

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n24p173

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Cinaría Albadri, Trinity College Dublin

Reviewer 2: Dr KPAN Oulai Jean Gautier, University Peleforo Gon Coulibaly of Korhogo (Côte d’Ivoire)

Published: 31.08.2020

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

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: Cinaria Albadri	Email:
University/Country: Trinity College Dublin	
Date Manuscript Received: 18/06/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/06/2020
Manuscript Title: Determination of Faecal Contamination of the Groundwater Resources from Tano Districts of Ghana	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 109.06.2020	
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.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i>
	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4 (Good)</b>
<i>Title is clear and is relevant to the purpose of the study</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2 (Fair)</b>
<i>Abstract is too short and weak. Lacks presenting objects and methods in a clear manner.</i> <i>Keywords formatted in a smaller size font.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3 (Average)</b>
<i>The manuscript contains slight spelling and grammar mistakes throughout the text, that requires a review by the author.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4 (Good)</b>
<i>- Methods, data collection and data analysis are clearly defined.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>3 (Average)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Generally, formatting and font size of body of the paper is clear.</li> <li>- Proofreading is required by the author/s to be free of grammar and spelling errors (there are some errors, ex. save drinking water = safe drinking water).</li> <li>- The acknowledgments section is missing (may be blinded by the editor).</li> </ul>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4 (Good)</b>
<i>Conclusion is accurately presented and supported by the content.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4 (Good)</b>
<i>- References are appropriate and up-to-date.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation):

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

- Minor corrections are required, as suggested above.
- Proofreading is required to avoid any grammar and spelling mistakes within the manuscript.

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

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: Dr KPAN Oulai Jean Gautier	Email:
University/Country: University Peleforo Gon Coulibaly of Korhogo (Côte d'Ivoire)	
Date Manuscript Received: jun 18 <sup>th</sup> 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: july 1 <sup>st</sup> 2020
Manuscript Title: <b>Determination of Faecal Contamination of the Groundwater Resources from Tano Districts of Ghana</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 06109/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

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

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The title is very clear and it is adequate to the content of the article</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>Minors mistakes</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
Yes	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Are the contaminations noted in this study specific or permanent?**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

