



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments														
I have discovered that some of the previous comments have not been addressed, for example, comment CM7. In order to make it easy to track comments and see how they have been addressed, I would prefer that the authors present their response to comments in the format below: <table><tr><th>Reviewer Comment</th><th>Author(s) responses (specific to each comment)</th></tr><tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr><tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr><tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr><tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr><tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr><tr><td> </td><td> </td></tr></table> The second comment is directed to the authors' rebuttal highlighted below. 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>COMMENT</u> I am still of the opinion that wells A₂ and E₁ need to be removed from the analysis, because of three reasons, stated below. First, in the rebuttal, the authors' state that stagnant water was dislodged by pumping for 10 minutes. However, in the revised manuscript, they state the stagnant water was dislodged by pumping for 90 seconds and allowed to recharge for 15 minutes. This is contradictory and inconsistent. Secondly, dislodging stagnant water from a water-well and allowing it to recharge is not a conventional method of water well disinfection. In the absence of published literature on such a method, it is indefensible to include wells A₂ and E₁ in the analysis, and therefore, therefore, they should be removed as recommended earlier. If the authors can quote authoritative published literature on such an unconventional method, let them share it. Finally, quick telephone calls to a few experts in this field confirmed that such a method would not achieve water-well disinfection. The bacteriological contamination would still remain.	Reviewer Comment	Author(s) responses (specific to each comment)													
Reviewer Comment	Author(s) responses (specific to each comment)														

Note: Anonymous Reviewer