

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_129289
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors Associated with Household Sanitation and Feacal Sludge Management (FSM) in Rural Communities of Ikwerre Local Government Area of Rivers State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	While we have made significant advancements with the management of FS and Sanitation, there are still quite a number of economic groups that are struggling with proper sanitation. There is evidence of continued health problems associated with improper faecal management, along with institutional and infrastructural limitations and breakdowns that must be addressed. Continued research into these situations and the best practices in other areas can provide well needed solutions to problems that affect the various socio-economic groups in several countries. This manuscript would need significant improvement to demonstrate its value to the body of knowledge in the community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Based on the contents of the article, the title needs to be refined further, maybe to “An assessment of some Factors Associated with Household Sanitation and Faecal Sludge Management (FSM) in Ikwerre Local Government Area of Rivers State, Nigeria”. The topic or the body should not speak to rural community and then goes on to describe the study area as peri-urban.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The Abstract could benefit from some editing, removing the first sentence in the background and go specifically into what the study is about. Also, the methodology portion seems to leave out key information on how the data was analysed and collected. While the author indicated that it was a quantitative study, in the body of the article there are frequent references to qualitative data from observations and other means that needs to be referenced in the abstract and the body. In addition, the keywords need to be reviewed to match the major topics of discussion.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Since I do not have access to the full data to try and reproduce the analysis, I cannot say for certain. However, it was noted that the nominal data was not used in the multiple regression analysis and so cannot be verified and seems to be ineffectively used for the data analysis. In addition, the author produced Likert Scale data and this would be best analysed using ordinal regression instead of multiple regression analysis. I would like see how the author came up with the results for Figure 3, because when you compare the information in Table 2 to that of Figure 3, there seems to be some conflicting results. There needs to be clarification of what the dependent variables and independent variables are and what the value is for this analysis. Which of the FSM practices is being used as the dependent variable?	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are too old and require more scholarly articles for support. Articles such as Strande et al 2018 “Methods to reliably estimate faecal sludge quantities and qualities...” Berendes 2017 ‘Safely managed Sanitation for all means faecal sludge management..’, Jain et al 2022, A review on the treatment of septage and faecal sludge management..., Juliet 2022 ‘ An assessment of the Health and Safety Practices in Faecal Sludge Management....’ Orugba et al 2024 Sustainable Faecal Sludge Management in Internally Displaced Persons Settlements in Tropical....”	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language needs scholarly improvement and has grammar and punctuation errors. Also, the structure of the paper needs work, for example, the author stated that Table 1 above has information but it is below the narration.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There are some key factors that would improve the value of this contribution that are missing from the article. They are as follows: 1. The socio-economic description of the study group could benefit from income data. This data could create a better view on the status of the group. In addition, it could lead to a better understanding of why the respondents function the way they do and why a large percentage had good practices. 2. The author should identify a key FSM variable that can be properly assessed using multiple regression analysis. Why include socio demographic data such as gender, age and education level if not to be measured against the independent variables? 3. The data from the qualitative study is necessary to indicate how the author arrived at some of the conclusions that are mentioned in the article. For example, saying that persons were observed defecating in the river that they used for water in the discussion section, but not indicating prior that the location was observed for a period of time and not providing the results of that observation needs to be addressed. 4. A proper description of the factors that were chosen needs to be done and an indication of why those factors were chosen for this specific study group in the methodology section would enhance the paper. 5. Why was this geographical location chosen? What is significant about that locality that makes this research necessary? Are there any notable practices that are applicable to other areas that can be modelled and therefore creates value? Would this information not be available in most of the communities of similar nature in Nigeria? 6. It would be valuable to add information on the current policy situation in Nigeria. Information on initiatives such as the High Priority Country Plan and Clean Nigeria: Use the Toilet and whether initiatives like these have made an impact or not is important to conclusions and recommendations being made by the author. Just saying there are no policies but not providing a good background on the situation in the country or the study location does not provide clarity to some discussions in the article. Further, the background of the study would benefit from this knowledge. 7. The strength of the paper is unrelated to the scientific data.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment (if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)</i> There appears to be no ethical challenges.	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	This would be clarified by a justification for the choice of study area and data collectors. Overall there seems to be no further issues.	

Review Form 3

If plagiarism is suspected, <u>please provide related proofs or web links.</u>		
---	--	--

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Reviewer:

I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) <u>Guideline:</u> Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	Rejected (3.5)

Review Form 3

Editorial Comments (This section is reserved for the comments from journal editorial office and editors):

	Author's Feedback

Reviewer Details:

This section is mandatory to prepare the Reviewer Certificate.
Please complete this section carefully. Reviewer Certificate will be generated by using this information only.
Your Certificate will be wrong, if you provide incorrect information.
Please note modification of certificate will not be possible after generation.
Certificate will not be issued if incomplete information is provided.

Name of the Reviewer	Macherie Grant
Department of Reviewer	
University or Institution of Reviewer	
Country of Reviewer	United States of America
Position: (Professor/lecturer, etc.) of Reviewer	Researcher/ Built Environment Specialist
Email ID of Reviewer	macheriegrant@gmail.com
WhatsApp Number of Reviewer (Optional)	
Write 5-8 Keywords regarding expertise of Reviewer	Urban Planning, Architecture, Construction Management, Human Settlements Research