



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_34699
Title of the Manuscript:	Potential Health Risks Associated with Consumption of Shallow Well Waters in Informal Settlements in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
Type of the Article	Research

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		
Minor REVISION comments	1. The use of term interview should be substituted by a suitable term i.e. consultation/conversation/questioning/cross-questioning/interrogation etc. 2. For lines 47-50 you should mention the source/reference where you have collected the data. 3. Recent population census should be given instead of 2002 (line no. 76). 4. Line no. 89-92 should be deleted. Simple write "A total of 350 household samples were obtained/collected for this study". 5. Mention the year(s) of study in the methodology. 5. It is desirable to give the coordinates of location wells as well as pit latrines in a tabular form. 6. Line no. 162 (check the "r" value) 7. Line no. 272 (The z test carried-out showed that there was a significant difference between acceptable distance between pit latrines and the wells and the observed distance ($p<0.001$) with z statistics = -33.7). How you have calculated both the p & z values? What is the physical meaning of p & z in this context? 8. Line no. 274 & 275 "This implies that the well operators have grossly violated the set sanitation standards and thereby pose the health threat to the neighboring population". In appropriate line. Because you have observed a significant difference. 9. Line no. 284. "negative total coliform" instead of negative you should use the term absent/ not detected etc.	1. Comment taken on board 2. Comment taken on board 3. Comment taken on board 4. Comment taken on board 5. Comment taken on board 6. Comment taken on board 7. Here is the response. We understand that in SPSS there is no option for carryingout z test directly. However there is an option of creating syntax that will enable one carry a z test. Therefore we created a syntax in SPSS that enabled us carryout a z test. Therefore the p and z values are produced by the software. The meaning of p is the probability of committing a type I error and this tells us if the difference is significant or it just happened by chance. 8. Thank you for the comment. The



SDI Review Form 1.6

	10. Line no. 285 “concentration of coliforms” should be written as “number of coliforms”. 11. Line no 317. “case study area” write only study area. 12. Sub-section 3.6. Perception or residents on the safety of well water. Correct it. 13. Avoid the term “testimony” use any other word for it. 14. Conclusion is missing. 15. In references, in certain cases you have used capital letters for writing the topic (beginning letters) and in certain cases you have used small letters. You should follow the pattern of journal.	sentence has been recast to avoid the misunderstanding 9. The comment has been taken on board 10. The comment has been taken onboard 11. The comment has been taken on board 12. Thank you for the comment. We have corrected 13. The word has been replaced 14. The heading for conclusion and recommendations has been included 15. The references have been edited to match with the journal's pattern
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		