

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Evelio Velis	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: Nov/04/2018	Date Review Report Submitted: Nov/08/2018
Manuscript Title: The Impact of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Services on Healthy Living in Sub-Saharan Africa	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 104.09.2018	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve your name as a reviewer of this paper is available on the ESJ's website: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title is not adequate. The study did not demonstrate a significant correlation between “adequate WASH services” and “healthy living.”	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The authors should clearly identify the main section sin the Abstract: Methods, Results, Conclusions, etc.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Authors should clearly report the <u>study design</u> and <u>analytical</u> approaches/techniques they used under <u>Methods</u> .	
5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <u>Under Conclusions authors stated:</u> “This paper has established that adequate WASH services are of utmost relevance to healthy living.” This conclusion implies a correlation between “adequate WASH services” and “healthy living” which was not established from the analysis/results.	
6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an **X** with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): Same as under Editor.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

1. The authors should clearly identify the main section in the Abstract: Methods, Results, Conclusions, etc.
2. Authors should clearly report the study design and analytical approaches/techniques they used under Methods.
3. Conclusion implies a **correlation** between “adequate WASH services” and “healthy living” which was not clearly established from the analysis performed and results.
4. Tables and results should be reported using the APA format.