

FINAL REVIEW COMMENTS

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_5079
Title of the Manuscript:	The impact of pit latrines on groundwater quality in Foko-slum, Ibadan, Southwestern Nigeria

Issue	New Reviewer Comment	Authors' feedback
Before fixing the regression equation, the authors should have demonstrated that relationship(s) exist between e-coli counts and distances. Scatter diagram, correlation coefficient, chi square by trend could be employed.	1) Not addressed as earlier advised in an earlier comment (CM19). Why?	We have established an inverse relationship between Faecal coliform value and distances through scatter diagram (Figure presented in the text)
Under 'Materials and Methods', it is reported as follows: Pre-sampling activities include pumping stagnant water out with a centrifugal pump for 90 seconds and the well allowed to recharge for about 15 minutes	2) In the earlier feedback to the authors, they were requested to provide published evidence on this unconventional method. This has not been provided. Secondly, why is the stagnant water being pumped out? It doesn't in any way disinfect the well if this is the intention.	We did not remove the stagnant water to disinfect the wells but to make sure the water samples being taken from the wells are representative sample of the aquifer and not water that might have spilled into the wells from runoff. It is not an unconventional method because it is adopted whenever any groundwater sampling is being done. Check Reference Number 1, 15 and 16 in the article.
Table 1 has been removed from the original article.	3) Why has the table been removed? The earlier comment (CM16) was: Remove A2 and E1 from the table and subsequent analysis.	We removed this table because other two reviewers asked us to remove some of its components and retain only the distance from the pit latrines. That was why we merged that component to tables 1a and 1b.
Wells A2 and E1	4) Have this been removed	We also removed Wells A2

	from the analysis of the data? 5) If yes, why has the minimum distance remained at 20m?	and E1 both from the table and analysis. The distance is now reduced to 19.75 m and after removing the out liars, it remains only four points on the scatter plot.
--	---	---

DECISION

New reviewer comments 1-5 need to be addressed by the authors.