



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. It is not clear what your investigation was trying to bring out, no discussion on the implications of the Chi-square statistic method the authors claimed to have used; May be if the essence of your investigation is discussed, various inferential statistics could have been suggested; 2. The reason/s for the use of chi-square method needs to be discussed. There are other statistical methods that have been used in water resources management apart from chi-square; 3. The author failed to reveal the characteristics of their respondents. This is expected if this work will be accepted for publication; Was there any raw data at all? 4. The authors need to provide the map of the study area to show its location in Ghana especially; If possible the map should show the five strata; 5. The authors failed to make recommendations having discovered the problem of off-season water supplies in your area of study. This should form part of the conclusion; 6. The methodology did not discuss the statistical method used; 7. How did you determine the quality of water in your study area. There is no sign that you did water quality assessment, thus rendering Table 3 irrelevant 8. Probably, the author may have to attach the questionnaire administered to ascertain the questions asked from their respondents; 	<p>(1), (2) The scope of the study was to look at the social aspects of water supply situations in a rural area of Ghana. One of the objectives of the study (NOW INSERTED IN THE REVISED MANUSCRIPT), was to determine the challenges that face water supply accessibility in the study area during the dry season. The Chi-square statistic component has now been removed from the revised manuscript to do away with any ambiguity.</p> <p>(3) The characteristics of the respondents in terms of their gender, age, highest educational level and duration of stay in the study area have now been inserted as highlighted with yellow colour in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>(4) The map of the study area showing its location in Ghana has now been inserted into the revised manuscript.</p> <p>(5), (6) Recommendation section has now been included in the revised manuscript and highlighted with a yellow colour with suggestions and recommendations made for further investigation and to ameliorate the problem of off-season water supply accessibility in the study area respectively.</p> <p>(7) The statistical method used (the descriptive statistical method) has now been inserted and highlighted in yellow colour under the methodology section in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>(8) The quality of the water in the study area as indicated in the manuscript was a perceived one from the findings of the study. However, all queries and suggestions have been taken and are considered to form the basis for a scientific assessment of the quality of all available waters sources in the study area in a subsequent study.</p> <p>(9) The questionnaire administered has now been inserted at the Appendix section of the revised manuscript and highlighted in yellow colour.</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	The abstract could be more concise to avoid waste of words.	The abstract has now been revised and reduced as highlighted in yellow colour in the revised manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The Figure 1 seems not necessary. The work is appropriate and reveals water supply situation in the rural areas of Ghana.	Figure 1 has now been removed from the revised manuscript.
---	--	--