

Review Form2

Book Name:	Current Progress in Arts and Social Studies Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_1951
Title of the Manuscript:	Community Participation in Integrated Water, Sanitation & Hygiene (WASH) Programs in Supply of Safe Water in Trans Nzioa, Kenya
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	- This manuscript is important for the scientific community with the following reasons. Community participation in integrated WASH program for safe water supply provision has aparamount importance for the scientific community since it gives good indication of decisions to be made by the decision makers, - taking into account the attitude, knowledge, trand and culture of one society/ community, understanding the community perception, practice and knowledge and applying it on WASH program implementation to supply safe water will give solutions to solveones problem by oneself/ by the existed community,which also will give lesson for the other community by using as basic information. - It gives us good information about the community participation on WASH program affects the effectiveness of the program directly or indirectly in that communityand also it indicates possible solution for the indicated problem. - Also the methodologies used to investigate are appropriate and reasonable for example purposive and proportional sampling,the no of 297 respondents are correct and justified clearly,in this regard it is possible to say that the manuscript is relevant. - In this manuscript I unsderstand that evaluating the community attitude, knowledge ,culture and traditional practices should be taken in to account before proceeding WASH program implementation,I like the motivation/ reason to start this work by considering the real problem face in the community that kenya faces considerable challenges in reaching in water sanitation and hygiene milliniu development goals.alot of articles were produced in this topic however the problem is still exist, so looking area specific solutions by making situational analysis is good concept to minimize the problem of water related problems ,Wash Problems by considering indigenous knowledge of the community should be given attention ,so this bookchapter takes agood look in this regard. Untouched and un seen indeginoue knowledge of the community with regard to WASH , water related problem prevention mechanisms, perceptions if they exist have to be deeply researched and documented to make this book chapter more acceptable.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	- The title is good ,however,this study evaluates water related challenges in the country ,not limiting to water supply and sanitation services . - The title does not describe all the works done in this manuscript , so in my view it will be more attractive and SMART if it is written as I sugest 'Role of community participation onintegrated WASH program and water related challenges in NZioa, Kenya'	

[Review Form2](#)

Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	• Delete sentences one(line) of the abstract ,since the main focus and objective of this manuscript is on NZioa ,Kenya,the abstract should start from that.it is all about developing worlds population water and sanitation status(not your result,).Ihave seen ordering problem of ideas in the abstract(first line should focus on the main objective of the manuscript, the themethodology,then result and conclusion),but it showed some result first, the objective, etc. it should be corrected(the flow of idea is not correct). • The word synergisticparner,affordable and household are mentioned as key words(words that mostfrequently used in the manuscript) however, mentioned only 2 times in the whole manuscript,so better to delete it and change by other word such as • The abstract tried to include all points from introduction to conclusion except the problem of flow of ideas and coherence while wrting and the problems with the key words Delet .37%......prevention. Change keywords by most reapedetly used words or phrases in the abstract part.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of this manuscript is appropraithowever,there are numbering problems insubsectionswrting such as without2,it says 2.1water related diseases,3.1 methodology,4.1 findings ,5.1 discusions,6.1 conclusion In my openioun, write 2water related diseases,3.methodoly,4.findings,5.discussion and 6.conclusion.if other subsections exist in each you can write as 3.1,4.1,5.1,6.1....	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound?Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	• Why you used ms excel and spss for one similar work? Do you mean that there is technical lack/problem of excell/ sppss which inforced you to use both of them?in my view no, you can use either excel or spss for you data analysis part(to measure central tendency).spssv16 is too old version so please use the most updated version,v23 .This manuscript is scientifically acceptibel since it follows scientific procedures such as clear objectives,clear and appropriait methodologies for achieving the objectives and appropriate and scientifically evident/ supported finds and discussion with good professional judgments. • The study show only 33%of households are accessible and can afford safe water which needs strong recommendation and decision,so particular solution and attention should be raised in this regard. • Why few of the men are involved in implementation eventhouth majority of men are enrolled in integrated community project,why? Clearly justify it • There are four main objectives raised in this manuscript but the recommendation part lacks to incorporate all those four objectives, try to encorporate all objectives in the recommendation section. •	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :	There are are some sentences without citationand also some old references which has to be replaced with recent once, example,conroy(2001-2002).southerland(1998),pretty(1998),Haines2004, etc are old references • Sentences without citations are seen in the methodology part(highlithed) and introduction parts. 4.1.1 better to put figure1, figure2. Table1 table 2 ,in the main body of the manuscript , these are not toomuch, it can be written in the main body part, instead of putting at the end(endex).	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language quality is good except some sentences which are written without separated by appropriatitnotations,;etc	
Optional/Generalcomments	This manuscript is written carefully and explained properly following scientific procedure, so it is acceptibel for publications with some comments to be coorrected.Those comments include Some modifaction in the title which could describe the whole work in SMART way Abstract has to be corrected in such away that start from the background and justification up to professional recommendations in afew and attractive words. Avoid delete unnecessary words or phrases and sentences in the abstract Introduction part is precice, descriptive and clear to be read and easily understandable Objective are straightforward and appropriait Methodologies are related and lined with objectives Findings are mentioned but needs more justifications and reasons Conclusions are lacking some data based conclusion and should be corrected Reccomendations lacks some problems of technical descriptions .with these I recommend this manuscript to be published with the modifications and corrections.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mulatu Kassa Gedamu
Department, University & Country	Woldia University, Ethiopia