



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_5079
Title of the Manuscript:	The impact of pit latrines on groundwater quality in Foko-slum, Ibadan, Southwestern Nigeria
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	See attached manuscript with comments. All the suggested revisions are compulsory. I prefer that in response, the authors in addition to submitting a revised manuscript, present a table showing how each of the comments have been addressed.	We have adopted pit latrines consistently in the revised article as suggested by this reviewer. Minor corrections identified have also been carefully attended to. Groundwater flow direction and velocity have been stated in the revised article and reference for it was also included. It has been stated that the wells we sampled were both protected and unprotected Sampling frequency and interval have been included. Total and Faecal coliform have been adopted to replace total bacterial count (TBC) in the initial write-up. Table one has been reformatted and integrated into table 2 as suggested by this reviewer. Study Limitation has been included in the new write-up. REBUTTAL We need not remove wells A₂ and E₁. From table 2 because we are of the opinions that since the wells were dislodged of stagnant water by pumping for 10 minutes and allowing the well to recuperate before sampling was done. The water sample is a representative of what is in the aquifer. Therefore, what come from surface as a result of lack of cover would have been taken care of by the method of sampling used.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	None	Minor correction suggested has been carefully considered and were attended to.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	None	
---	------	--