

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_125843
Title of the Manuscript:	HOUSEHOLD LEVEL SANITATION PRACTICES AND THEIR IMPLICATION ON THE OCCURRENCE OF DIARRHOEA AND OTHER RELATED INFECTIONS IN TEMEKE MUNICIPALITY
Type of the Article	Manuscript

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This manuscript offers important insights into household-level sanitation practices and their role in the spread of diarrheal and related infections in Temeke Municipality. It addresses key public health issues by examining sanitation access and hygiene behaviors in a low-income, urban context. The study's use of both quantitative and qualitative data strengthens its findings and highlights the critical link between socio-economic factors and sanitation. Its relevance is clear for policymakers and public health professionals focused on improving sanitation and hygiene in underprivileged communities. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>Yes it is suitable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It clearly reflects the scope and focus of the study by emphasizing the key variables: sanitation practices and their health implications, specifically diarrheal and related infections. The inclusion of the study location, Temeke Municipality, adds context, making it clear where the findings are applicable. Overall, the title is informative. 	
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.	<p>The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit from some improvements. It clearly outlines the study's objective, methodology, findings, and recommendations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> However, the objective should explicitly highlight the public health relevance of studying sanitation practices related to diarrheal diseases. The sampling method and data collection techniques could be clarified with more details. Key findings, such as percentages, should be condensed to focus on major issues like poor latrine conditions and limited handwashing facilities. Lastly, the conclusion could provide more actionable recommendations, such as specific strategies for improving sanitation infrastructure or behavior change interventions. These enhancements would improve clarity and focus. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>The manuscript has an appropriate structure, including key components such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction: Establishes the relevance of the public health issue. Methodology: Clearly outlines the quantitative and qualitative approaches used. Findings: Presents relevant data that connect to the research question. Discussion: Interprets the findings, though it could benefit from deeper analysis. Recommendations: Offers practical suggestions based on the findings. Conclusion: Summarizes the main points and emphasizes the study's significance. <p>Overall, while the structure is sound, enhancing the depth of the discussion and recommendations would improve the manuscript's impact.</p>	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to its clear and systematic methodology, using a cross-sectional design with a mixed-methods approach. Quantitative data are well-supported by statistical analysis, and qualitative insights add depth. The random sampling enhances the generalizability of findings. Importantly, the study addresses public health issues by linking household sanitation practices 	

Review Form 3

	<p>to diarrheal disease occurrence and offers practical recommendations for improving sanitation infrastructure and promoting behavior change. However, it contains a few scientific gaps as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It identifies associations between poor sanitation and diarrheal diseases but lacks an in-depth exploration of causal relationships and the behavioral factors driving sanitation practices. • Additionally, its focus on one geographical area (Temeke Municipality) limits the generalizability of the findings, and the cross-sectional design restricts temporal analysis. • While water scarcity is mentioned, more detailed exploration of how water access affects hygiene could provide further insight. Addressing these areas would enhance the study's depth and applicability. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are somewhat sufficient but could benefit from updating. While the manuscript provides a good foundation, many of the sources are from earlier years (2002–2017), which may not reflect the latest findings and developments in sanitation practices and public health. To improve the manuscript's scientific rigor, more recent references (post-2020) should be added, particularly in areas like behavioral interventions, climate change impacts, and updated WHO/UNICEF WASH reports. This will ensure the manuscript aligns with current research and recommendations.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript's language is generally clear but needs improvement for scholarly communication. Some sentences are lengthy and unclear, with minor grammatical errors and punctuation inconsistencies. To meet academic standards, the writing should be more concise, precise, and formal. A thorough proofreading and editing process would enhance the overall quality and readability.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The analysis of findings for Tables 2, 3, and 4 should be placed immediately before their respective tables. This change will improve clarity and allow readers to better understand the context and significance of the data, creating a more coherent flow in the manuscript.</p> <p>Overall, the manuscript is scientifically sound but would benefit from improvements in language, updated references, and deeper analysis.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joseph Ekal Lolepo
Department, University & Country	Turkana Institute of Health and Psychological Studies, Kenya