



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_5534
Title of the Manuscript:	PLANNING AND EXECUTION OF THE EUROPEAN UNION-ASSISTED WATER SUPPLY AND SANITATION PROJECTS IN IMO STATE, NIGERIA: CONSTRAINTS, LESSONS AND SUCCESS FACTORS
Type of the Article	Research paper

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:

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The content is good, but there are several weaknesses which make the reading difficult. Your tables are very bad. Even in size A3 I cannot read them. I good table should contain less than 10 columns and rows. It is not necessary to inform the same in text and tables. I propose that you replace your Tables either with <u>summary</u> Tables including only distribution-% and N but not informing the situation in different smaller areas but a combination or you will present pie or column figures. The report given to different areas is not the same as a scientific article. A table using the same font as the text <u>must fit</u> to one page. Improve also your figures 1 and 2. Increase the size of these map figures up to one page and if a name do not fit to the area shorten the name in map and explain in legend! You can use for different lines different line types, if the colours are not possible. Your sentences are too long. If a sentence will continue to more than 3 lines, cut it to two or three sentences and think do you need all words. Cut also the too long paragraphs so that in one page there could be three or four shorter paragraphs.	<u>AUTHORS' FEEDBACK</u> Thank you for the comments. <u>My comments:</u> 1. The Tables are now in summary forms. 2. The figures have been improved. 3. Many variables and factors are involved in the discussion of the results. Though, most of the sentences are long, but they seem to convey the findings in a more coherent manner. 4. Paragraphing is now consciously observed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		5. The fish-bow has been explained in the



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Explain in line 181 the fish-bowl technique! Instead percent use %! It would be interesting to know how many persons were served to improve their sanitation and how many by improved their water supply (in this order). Similarly it would be important to tell how big funding came from EU and how much from Niger state or states, municipals and private sources.	corrected work. 6. The use of % is good. However, i decided to continue with 'percent' for other scholastic reasons. 7. Revealing how many were served and whose conditions are improved is taken. As a reminder, this paper is on the identification or isolation of the preponderant factors of constraints, lessons and successes in planning and executing the projects. The issues of effects are handled in another paper.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	If you must report the situation in each area separately, do that in a separate attachment. Even in this case omit the first paragraph showing the numbers 1-29.	