

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_95157
Title of the Manuscript:	Wind speed thresholds for adjusting conventional design criteria for the ventilated improved pit latrine without compromising odour control
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:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1 Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community as it illuminates on innovation/ adjustments that can be made to satisfy personal preferences and reduce costs in a VIP latrine technology. It is only through sound scientific research that we can improve functionality of structures such as VIP latrine to maximize health benefits, reduce costs and minimize discomfort. It also ensures that standards accommodate what happens in real life experiences.</p> <p>2 The title of the article is suited to this research piece</p> <p>3 The abstract is not good enough as it has some glaring shortfalls. It needs revising to make it a perfect representation of the paper</p> <p>4 Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</p> <p>5 Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6 Yes the references are sufficient and recent</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, but words such as "enjoyed" are not appropriate. I have used track changes icon in the text to help make decisions on changes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall the paper is well written but needs minor adjustments. The literature review in the introduction is well crafted. The data analysis subsection does not show Confidence Intervals and may be the sampling frame should have been large enough to avoid spurious results. This means more comparative experiments should have been set up in different locations.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Twitty Munkhondia
Department, University & Country	Unicaf University, Malawi