



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_61359
Title of the Manuscript:	A cross-sectional epidemiological survey on drinking water, sanitation and hygiene amongst residents of Bamboutos Division, West Region Cameroon: a Knowledge, Attitude and Practice (KAP) study.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract is rather voluminous, it ought to be devoid of details. Also the conclusion of the abstract is silent on 'attitude & Practices', which are equally very important in relation to the work, only 'knowledge' was emphasized 2. Bamboutous division is further subdivided into Babajou, Batcham, Galim & Mbouda districts, on what basis was Babajou & Mbouda selected for survey, to ensure they are truly representative of Bamboutous Division? 3. The Fonyuy sample size formula was employed to arrive at 197 samples (questionnaires), yet ignored. The study went further to deploy 460 questionnaires/samples without a clear justification. 4. The sampling technique employed should have stated 'systematic and Purposive', since the systematic was used to select the buildings, while the purposive was employed to select the adult samples. 5. Findings 4.1 (behaviour of participants during collection, storage and preservation of water according to sub-divisions), 5 (relationship between good practices, good knowledge and level of education) and 6 (determinants of occurrences of WBD in households) declared P values without declaring the required null hypothesis. 6. IS Fonyuy a sample size formula? Or an authority in sample size determination? (I doubt) 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Page 2, paragraph 1: The SDGs succeeded the MDGs, not the other way round. 2. Contradictions in declarations (Discussion, paragraph 3): "Most respondents knew at least one waterborne disease, but the level of knowledge was low as a whole." 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General Grammatical error: punctuations, subject-verb agreement (<i>Perhaps this occurred as a result of translation into English language</i>) 2. The tables and charts could have been incorporated into the body of the report for additional emphasis. 	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ajakaiye Olabisi Olabode
Department, University & Country	Yaba College Of Technology, Nigeria