Reviewer’s report

Title: Domestic waste disposal practice and perceptions about health in urban Accra

Version: 1  Date: 5 April 2014

Reviewer: Eugene E Ezebilo

Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript has focused on domestic waste disposal practices and perceptions of private participation in waste collection in a city in developing country. This is an important subject especially in developing countries where the rise of middle class has led to increase consumption of various goods and consequently more domestic waste generated. However, the methods used in collecting data used in the study has not been described in details and it is not very clear the method used, e.g. here and there the authors mentioned they used interviews, but still in some places they mentioned that questionnaire was used. The specific comments are:

TITLE

This title seems not to capture the main content of the manuscript. The content is mainly on different methods that households have used to dispose residential solid waste and whether they are satisfied with the services of private waste collectors. Consider changing the title to say:

Domestic waste disposal practices and perceptions of private participation in waste management in Accra, Ghana

ABSTRACT

Method: The authors have mentioned that they have used both quantitative and qualitative data collection techniques. This does not make sense! I can’t really figure out the quantitative data that was collected. It is important for the authors to mention exact method that was used for collecting data e.g. interviews, questionnaire or interviews and questionnaire.

The authors stated that 364 respondents were interviewed in the quantitative survey. I am surprise to read this because the authors mentioned on “Study design” section that structured questionnaire was used for quantitative survey. It is important for the authors to clarify the data collection method they have used and include how the sample was selected, e.g. random, systematic or stratified. On the other hand on “Study population” section the authors reported that 400 questionnaires was administered but they again reported on the “Abstract” section that 364 respondents were interviewed.

Second to the last sentence under “Results” change most the respondents to most of the respondents.
The last sentence under “Results”, i.e. There was a general conclusion that children should be responsible for waste management. I am surprise to read this conclusion! The results on Table 4 is about involving children in cleaning not waste management as a whole. Waste management involves a lot of tasks such as collection, transportation, disposal and treatment of waste.

Conclusion: Change prevent the public from diseases to reducing exposure of public to diseases.

BACKGROUND
- Merge the 2nd paragraph with the 1st.
- 4th sentence in 2nd paragraph: Supply reference(s) to support the claim.
- Last sentence in 2nd paragraph: Delete significantly. Change the communities to their communities.
- Merge paragraphs 3, 4 and 5.
- Reference 17 is not appropriate here. Include reference related to Ghana.
- 2nd to the last sentence in the last paragraph: This sentence is not very clear. I cant really figure out the meaning of heavy here!
- Last sentence in the last paragraph: waste management the should read waste management.

METHODS
Study design
- Please, explain briefly what is meant by qualitative and quantitative data collection methods.
- I am surprise to read here that questionnaire was used in the study but on the Abstract section it says that interview was applied. So which data collection was actually used? Was the questionnaire tested before the main survey? If yes, then how?
- By the way, explain how the questions included in the questionnaire and interview developed.
- Please, include questions that were used for this study. Also include how the questionnaire was delivered to people who participated in the survey.

Study area
- How were Madina selected among the sub-municipalities or is there specific reasons for selecting Madina for the study?
- Explain the reasons for conducting the study in Nkwatanaa.
- A map of Ghana showing the location of the study area will add value to this manuscript.

Study population
- 3rd sentence, i.e. The Ga East ... estimated population of 108,825. But Ga East is not the study area. It is Nkwakamma you have studied so provide population for the exact study area.

- Please, explain how the 400 people selected for the study were identified. Was it through telephone directory, address listing document or census?

- Last sentence in the 1st paragraph: This sampling description is not that of random sampling procedure. It is systematic sampling procedure. Now again the authors are claiming that they have used interview for collecting data. It is not clear about the actual used in this study! Here you read that interview was used and other places you read that questionnaire was used.

Data analysis

- Please, explain briefly the thematic framework procedures.

Results

- 1st sentence in 1st paragraph, i.e. A total of 364 respondents were involved in the study: No! According to the authors’ report in the “Study population” section 400 people were involved but only 364 responded to the so called questionnaire.

- 2nd - last sentence in paragraph 1 are repetitions of all information on Table 1. Please, avoid repetitions.

- 2nd and 3rd paragraphs: Most of the information presented here are repetition of what has been presented on Table 2.

- Majority of the respondents, 76.5% are that solid waste management is important: This sentence is not clear and this paragraph is repetition of what was presented on Table 4.

DISCUSSION

- Start this section with discussion of the most important results.

- 4th to last sentence in the last paragraph: This is repetition of results.

- Please, explain in details the implications of the results on waste management policy/policy in Ghana and what could be done to improve the current situation in the study area.

- Limitations of the study has not been discussed.

CONCLUSIONS

- 4th sentence, i.e. The provision of more collecting bins ...: This conclusion do not support the results/is not drawn from the results.

LANGUAGE

The language is generally OK but there are errors here and there. This manuscript requires a thorough language editing.

-Avoid repetitions throughout the manuscript.
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