



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_37744
Title of the Manuscript:	How safe is sachet water consumption in the Hohoe municipality 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	1. The research paper does possesses important information on drinking water management with scientific approaches in testing the sachet water contamination levels. But research paper format is not been followed. It should now be reorganized on the below given format; a. Abstract - given b. Introduction- given c. Literature review - not given - and the same can be incorporated under separate paragraph , covering half a page. d. Research Objectives - not given- Precise study objectives in bullet format be mentioned under separate paragraph to make the study more eye catching and clear understandings of the readers. e. Materials and Methods- Given f. Results and Discussion- Given g. Recommendations- Given i. Conclusion-Given 2. Additional information on the following aspects needs to be which add value to the research paper; a. Source water quality (important parameters, like fluoride, iron, manganese, magnesium, arsenic, other trace elements) should also be added for want of presence of bio-logical and chemical contaminants. b. Water treatment methods for sachet water and make and types of packaged material , containing water . or composition of media which is being used for water treatment. c. Total storage time of sachet water in the packing, before its sold and consumed . d. Chemical analysis of sachet water should also be included while carrying out biological analysis of sachet water	The Authors really appreciate your comments. Thanks for your time and energy. Thanks for the commendation and the notification. c. Literature review: This is not required in the guideline for the authors and therefore omitted. However, the review of literature is elaborated under “Introduction” which is clearly stated in the guideline. This is a quote from the guideline under Introduction, “Provide a <i>factual background, clearly defined problem, proposed solution, a brief literature survey and the scope and justification of the work done</i>”. d. Research Objectives: Please we are confused as to Research Objective in the Abstract or Research Objective as per Authors Guideline? To clear doubt, the objective of the study is restructured in the last paragraph under “Introduction”. Please check the highlight. line 49-51. Thank you very much for the comment 2. Very laudable comments. However, we did not measure ALL chemical elements of the samples because of our interest in a baseline study and lack of funding. Nevertheless, this baseline study calls for further study into the major and other trace elements of the water samples. This is added to the recommendation. line 234-236. Interestingly, water treatment methods, storage time and type of packaging which could be cause of contamination is currently being assessed in another future qualitative study as recommended by this study.
Minor REVISION comments	1. The results shown in the table format are suggested to be shown/ be presented in graphical format as well for easy assimilation of the reader . 2. These are OK, Preferably , reference sitting should be on the line of APA format. DOI persistent links to those references that have DOIs should be added	We thought of it. We tried doing it for the most applicable table which is Table 2. However, it was rather more confusing and not looking nice in graphical form. Thanks for the comment. Authors’ guideline with respect to referencing was duly followed. Journals with available DOIs were added.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	1. Study area location map be added for more clarity for the readers. 2. What are the water born, water based and water washed related disease prevalence statistics of target area , before and after consumption of sachet water (data from secondary sources can be mentioned just to compare with the existing situation of heath statistics . 3. Photographs of sachet manufacturers work place to ascertain health and hygiene environments , or to know the chances of environment bacteria finding its way to water processing system during preparation , or during packing etc Note: If possible , research paper to be reviewed be shared in word format for track change comments	Thanks for optional comments. 1. This could be illustrative for non-localized study area. This is just a small localized area in the region of Volta. 2. For option 2, the comment required a whole comparative study which the authors will love to look at another time. Water related diseases were recorded in the municipality but were not confirmed to be caused by water. However, the authors added few statements to describe the study area. Line 67-69. 3. As mentioned earlier in your compulsory revision comments, the study recommends a qualitative study to capture gaps in this baseline study.