



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. Also, no research ends in itself but rather gives way to further research: The authors did not make any suggestion/s for further investigation; 7. The methodology did not discuss the statistical method used; 8. 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 9. Probably, the author may have to attach the questionnaire administered to ascertain the questions asked from their respondents; 	
Minor REVISION comments	The abstract could be more concise to avoid waste of words.	
Optional/General comments	<p>The Figure 1 seems not necessary.</p> <p>The work is appropriate and reveals water supply situation in the rural areas of Ghana.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	T. O. Ogunbode
Department, University & Country	College of Health Sciences, Bowen University, Nigeria