

Manuscript: “**Impact Of Lateral Separations Between Pit Latrines And Wells On Contamination Of Groundwater In The Tano Districts Of Ghana**”

Submitted: 16 June 2020

Accepted: 28 August 2020

Published: 30 November 2020

Corresponding author: Frank Awuah

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n33p303](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n33p303)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Valeria Santa,
Universidad Nacional de Río Cuarto, Argentina

Reviewer 2: Dr. Daniel Nkontcheu,
University of Buea, Cameroon

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: Valeria Santa | Email: |
| University/Country: Universidad Nacional de Río Cuarto / Argentina | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 19-06-2020 | Date Review Report Submitted: 25-06-2020 |
| Manuscript Title: IMPACT OF LATERAL SEPARATION BETWEEN PIT LATRINES AND WELLS ON CONTAMINATION OF GROUNDWATER IN THE TANO DISTRICTS OF GHANA | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 110.06.2020 | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No | |
| You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No | |

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] |
|--|---|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 5 |
| <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. | 4 |
| There are some drafting errors in the text. "et al" and scientific names must go with Italics | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 3 |
| There are some errors in the text like: different types and sizes of letters, extra spaces, missing spaces | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| There are some missing quote in bibliography and differences in the yaers, and some quotes are missing from the text | |

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

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: | Email: |
| University/Country: | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 29/06/2020 | Date Review Report Submitted: 30/06/2020 |
| Manuscript Title: Impact of lateral separation between pit latrines and wells on contamination of groundwater in the Tano Districts of Ghana | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 06110/20 | |
| 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 “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] |
|--|---|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 4 |
| <i>The title is clear, well stated and easy to understand</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 3 |
| <i>The abstract has many grammatical errors and should start with background</i> | |

| | |
|--|----------|
| <i>statement before the aim of the study</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 2 |
| <i>The article is full of grammatical errors (punctuation, spacing, conjugation) as well as spelling mistakes. The work must be proof-read!.</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 3 |
| <i>The methodology is not clear. No mention of the sampling frequency and the duration of the study</i> | |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 3 |
| <i>The body is clear but has a few errors</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 3 |
| <i>Conclusions are clear but no recommendation to the local population and authorities</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 2 |
| <i>There are many references but poorly organized, some are not complete. Difficult to differentiate between one reference and the next</i> | |

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- The topic is very interesting and has direct public health use. But the article was written with a lot of precipitation.
- Too many grammatical errors and proof-reading is needed from a native English language speaker or somebody who masters the language.
- There are sudden changes in characters and sizes throughout the article and uniformity is needed.
- How can you do such a study with no recommendation to the local population?