

Review of: "Assessment of Quality of drinking waterbased on the water quality index method in Hawassa Zuria Woreda, Sidama Regional State, Ethiopia"

Stephen Opiyo¹

¹ Kenyatta University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I believe this paper is scientifically interesting, well written and is important to publish in order to increase our understanding of the quality of various drinking water supply sources in Hawassa Zuria Wored region of Ethiopia. And also to support other studies that can make use of this kind of combined indices and statistical analyses to report complex water quality information in a non-technical manner that can be understood by both professionals and the general public. The general structure of the paper is sufficient. However, the manuscript has some minor problems that can be addressed, as outlined below.

1. Grammatical errors in the whole document should be double-checked professionally using tools like grammarly.
2. Lines 1 and 2 of second paragraph of intro should be deleted since it's simply a repetition of what's covered in first paragraph. Also, the second paragraph should be combined with the first.
3. The last paragraph should clearly explain the research gap, explain in depth why you are focusing on this region and its water sources: what are the main local water quality related issues/challenges that informed the need for this study, and why it seems relevant/important to use the indices to answer those challenges. Also, talk about how will the results help practically? The last paragraph of intro attempts to delineate the research gap but it's not sufficient enough. Kindly strengthen it as advised.
4. What procedure did you use in selecting the sampling sites? Was it purposive or systematic? Kindly make that clearer.
5. What time of the day were these samplings taking place? Were the depths of the boreholes the same or were you collecting these samples at certain predetermined depths? Which specific APHA standard methods did you use, please provide a citation for this including the year for the version you used.
6. How many months was the study undertaken? Was it in one single season or various seasons? If more than one season, there should be analysis on seasonal variability.
7. Throughout the entire manuscript, there should be a good balance between the old and more current references.
8. APHA, 1999 is too old, I believe there are recent versions with one recent one produced in 2017. Kindly check it out and update accordingly.
9. A little background is needed about who created each of these indices and when they were developed and by why? And please provide citations.
10. The Discussion section as it appears now is well written but it would be easy to read and understand if you could

incorporate all those tables containing the results in it so that the section now becomes a combined **Results and Discussion**.

11. Conclusion need to be revised and must include how the outcome should contribute in society as well in SDG 6.
12. Reference list seem to be having inconsistent styles, kindly stick with one style, preferably APA format.