

Paper: “The Effect of Improved Water, Sanitation and Hygiene on Linear Growth Amongst Children Living in Developing Countries: A Systematic Review”

Submitted: 11 July 2022

Accepted: 27 September 2022

Published: 30 September 2022

Corresponding Author: Elton Chavura

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n30p296](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n30p296)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Save Kumwenda
Mzuzu University, Malawi

Reviewer 2: Mario Adelfo Batista Zaldivar
Technical University of Manabi, Ecuador

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer K:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title does not represent what the manuscript is about. The title looks at the impact of improved sanitation while the manuscript is about the impact of water supply, sanitation and hygiene. In some cases, the content only talks about the impact of sanitation. Authors need to be consistent on whether they are considering improved sanitation alone, or water supply alone, or hygiene alone or WASH.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, however, the abstract does not state clearly how key words were combined during the search.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Yes, the article is well written. Only minor errors like Table 1 needs formatting. The reference section is missing.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods section need to be revised. There is need to present the search outcome first before the data collection process from the searched articles.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body is clear. Be clear on the focus as explained under the topic.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The summary is accurate apart from making it clear on the focus of the study, whether WaSH or sanitation or hygiene or water supply. Also there is need to come clear on what may have led to lack of association. The limitations should be clear for such a study. These may have led to the outcome observed.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is missing. Please include.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

There is need to work on the title. Once you choose one field i.e. WaSH or Water Supply or Sanitation or Hygiene, make sure you revise the whole manuscript to reflect that.

Revise your methods section. Its confusing to see the 14 papers as meeting the search criteria and then later you discover there were a lot more retrieved.

Reference section is missing, please include

You need to clearly discuss the limitations of this study. These will give a clear indication why the study did not find any relationship or they will provide backing if the lack of relationship is indeed the true result.

Reviewer M:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title of the article adequately summarizes its objectives and results, as well as its discussion.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract clearly presents the objective, the methodology used and the results of the study; however, it is recommended to write it in a single paragraph and in the preterite tense.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

No grammatical or spelling errors were found that could affect the quality of the writing and comprehension of the article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodology used in the research is adequate, and it is clearly explained in detail.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The editing of table 2 should be improved, since hidden information appears because it exceeds the margins of the sheet.

Table 3 should also be improved, as some words are cut off, as well as incorrect margins in the text within the columns.

Most of the text of the article is written in the first person, so it is recommended that it be written in the third person or impersonal.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

La única conclusión que aparece en el artículo no sistetiza todos los hallazgos encontrados en la investigación.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The bibliographic references consulted do not appear in the article.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer N:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear including briefly the chosen topic, countries, and methodology.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, I confirm it.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

As far as I noticed there are more than 100 typos, or grammatical issues, or similar issues that need to be corrected.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Relatively clear and complete. PRISMA statement was intended to be followed. Not all of the items of PRISMA checklist needed for a transparent reporting of a systematic review were included.

For example: Item 15 - Risk of bias across studies: the possibility of biased available data should have been explored.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

It is logically clear and relatively well-structured. The content needs to be revised grammatically and in terms of typo errors.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

5 lines in total for the conclusion section were provided. It is not enough. Implications for future research are missing. Moreover, possible limitations of the work were not mentioned. Was there any limitation of the search or studies selection?

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes. Some statements done in the text are too much aggregated to be referred to a study or not referred to at all. For example: "Constant exposure to poor sanitation contributes to the environmental enteric dysfunction-a disorder that is frequently implicated as a cause of linear growth failure." Source: missing!!!

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In general, the systematic review is relatively correctly done. PRISMA statement needs to be followed for future work more accurately.
