

Review of: "Examining Water Use and Sanitation Practices in Rural Schools of Chegutu District, Mashonaland West Province, Zimbabwe"

Subhadra Channa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper is comprehensive on certain counts, like it has covered a lot of areas related to WASH facilities and their lack, in schools in the poor and backward areas of Africa (Zimbabwe). The study covers four schools in the rural areas and outlines the presence of more often the lack of WASH facilities in schools in this region. The reasons listed comprise of lack of resources, lack of funding as well as a lack of comprehension of the implications of bad sanitation and hygiene facilities in schools. There seems to be apathy at the official or higher end as well as at the level of the stakeholders. Students, teachers and administrative staff at these schools seem to have little awareness about the importance of hand washing and hygiene in school. The lack of resources present a dismal picture with only hand pumps available for drinking water, a water that is often polluted and tastes bad. The schools are not much bothered as their students enrollment is on the upside and not decreasing much in spite of the pitiful inadequacy of facilities. It appears that the students themselves are trying to adapt to the situation by various means like carrying their own drinking water to school and not using the toilets.

Some of the data is quite substantial but some parts are missing. There is no response recorded directly from the students or the teachers, although the scholar claims that he recorded qualitative narratives from both categories. The paper relies more on qualitative data, which is alright but would have been more enriching to get some narratives from the field as well. The paper is quite informative but does not fulfill the promise of the amount of data apparently collected. The descriptions are sketchy and could have been filled out more. Further there is hardly any outcome except for the suggestions made by the scholar which are not very well presented.

The language is just about adequate and there are lots of grammatical mistakes including the mixing up of the tenses. The paper suffers from poor language constructions and grammatical mistakes. Overall a paper that could have been much more but still manages to convey some important data.