

# Review of: "The Failure of Public Water Utility Privatization From Araral's Perspective: Implications for Ethiopia's Water Sector"

Anamika Barua<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript discusses the failure of water utility public privatization and Araral's perspective on water privatisation, using the two hypotheses – fiscal and efficiency. I have some major observations related to the paper.

1. Poorly structured – since the study is on Ethiopia, why not discuss Ethiopia's water sector first, and then draw from the different cases worldwide the failure and success of privatization. How can the same be better applied in the case of Ethiopia, what needs to be done to make it a success?
2. The two hypothesis – fiscal and efficiency is fine and can be the focus of analysis for the entire paper, including for Ethiopia. However, the paper starting from the introduction, does not have a good flow and is unclear what argument the author is making.
3. Limitations come in between, but the major limitation is there is no methodology, how the papers were selected, and why a few papers were reviewed when there are so many papers on this subject. All the papers reviewed are very old, most of them were published between 2000 to 2010 – what is the idea behind it?
4. Plethora of literature – but I did not see much literature which is evident from the reference section. In the beginning, the author states that the paper will focus on the work of Prof. Araral, but then it deviates. So not clear at all the focus and scope of the paper.
5. The most important point is Ethiopia should be at the centre and could be discussed from the two hypotheses mentioned in the paper.
6. In several places, the author uses the line 'the author suggests, the author found that- I am not clear who is this author, I assume that it is probably the author of the paper and if that is the case, it is not correct to write like that. Instead, the author can use "we found" or the "study found."
7. Finally, the findings are too generic, what is novel about this paper? The paper makes a few suggestions, such as the need for public-private participation, capacity building, regulations, budget etc., but they are very generic and are known to all. What is missing is its relevance to Ethiopia's context.

Overall, the paper cannot be published in its present form. It needs major revision bringing Ethiopia to the centre and analysing Araral's perspective - works or not.

