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Reviewer's report:

1. The title of the paper could be rephrased.

2. The authors followed JMP definition of improved sanitation which is an international standard of measuring and comparing sanitation status. Each country has their own policy and definitions regarding sanitation that should be addressed.

3. It seems to me that the methodology is much generalized. It should be elaborated mentioning search engine applied for information. Some review papers which have already been published can be followed to improve methodology section.

4. Maintenance of pit latrine such as cleaning requires large amount of water which is a significant problem in water shortage area. However this problem is less stressed in this paper. Moreover, some households break water seal to use less water. This might have cultural implications in hygiene practice, thus latrine performance. Cultural issues of users could be described to signify the subject in particular context.

5. Success and failure of each sanitation technology can be described and represented in a table.

6. There are some grammatical mistakes. Usage of English language should be improved.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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