



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_43019
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of off-season water supply situation: The case of Abetifi in the Kwahu-East District of Ghana.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Write the objectives of the work and include them in the Introduction section. 2) Keep one section as description of study area and remove study area from methodology section. 3) Include "location map of study area" in the description of study area. 4) Provide flowchart for methodology and clearly explain about the techniques adopted. 5) Is there anyone used this technique (SRS) previously for this purpose or any other purpose? If so please include some of the references. 6) In fig.2, you can also include design and operation of water supply system which will influence reliability of the system. 7) Conclusions need to be quantified and elaborated. 	<p>(1) The objectives of the work have now been included in the Introduction section and highlighted in yellow colour in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>(2) The heading "description of study area" has now been created and removed from the methodology section as highlighted in yellow colour in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>(3) Location map of study area has now been included in the description of area in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>(4) Additional sub-headings such as "Primary data collection", "Data analysis and presentation" have been inserted under the methodology section to clearly bring out the flow in the methodology process. Moreover, the contents under the methodology section have now been revised to explain the techniques adopted.</p> <p>(5) The stratified sampling technique has been used by several authors in different and diverse areas of study. The authors have now referenced or cited this technique used under methodology section in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>(6) The scope of the study was to look at the social aspects of water supply situations in a rural area of Ghana but not the technicalities involved. However, the authors are grateful for this suggestion which will form the basis for subsequent studies.</p> <p>(7) The conclusion section has now been elaborated and now answers the objectives set under the introduction section.</p> <p>The authors would like to say they are grateful for your constructive criticisms and queries which have helped enriched the quality of the manuscript.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In Abstract, Approximately (Approx.) word is used several times 2) Line-1: "Water they say is life." – here, they means who? 3) Line-25-27: Water – context of using it needs to be checked. It is used several times. 4) Line-43: earth's – e should be capital (Earth's) 5) Line-80 : SDG 6- What is this? 6) Line 138-139 : "Frequency occurrences for different durations at which people accessed water and returned to their homes were not the same ($\chi^2 = 83.52$, $df = 3$)" – why the author is comparing the accessing time and return to home time? How they are relevant? What are the factors influencing the duration to rerun home after accessing water? 7) Line 202: summary of may be used instead of summary for since for is used two times. 	<p>(1) The word "Approximately" has now been written once in the abstract.</p> <p>(2) "Water they say is life" has now been removed from the revised manuscript.</p> <p>(3) The word "water" has now been reduced to only one in the sentence and highlighted in yellow colour in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>(4) earth's – e has now been changed to capital (Earth's) and highlighted in yellow colour in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>(5) SDG means Sustainable Development Goal and has now been written in full in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>(6) The Chi-square statistic component has now been removed from the revised manuscript to do away with any ambiguity.</p> <p>(7) "Summary for" has now been replaced with "Summary of".</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I appreciate the authors for carrying out this work. But if they can include some more technical aspects, it would become a very good paper. Also you can use a single index to determine the satisfaction levels of the consumers. Fuzzy logic may be used for that purpose.	The scope of the study was to look at the social aspects of water supply situations in a rural area of Ghana but not the technicalities involved. However, the authors are grateful for this suggestion which will form the basis for subsequent studies.