

The *South African Journal of Science* follows a double-anonymous peer review model but encourages Reviewers and Authors to publish their anonymised review reports and response letters, respectively, as supplementary files after manuscript review and acceptance. For more information, see [Publishing peer review reports](#).

Peer review history for:

Odume ON, Chili A, Nnadozie CF, Slaughter A. Stakeholder contestations of water quality use and management in the Vaal Barrage catchment. *S Afr J Sci.* 2024;120(9/10), Art. #17887. <https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2024/17887>

HOW TO CITE:

Stakeholder contestations of water quality use and management in the Vaal Barrage catchment [peer review history]. *S Afr J Sci.* 2024;120(9/10), Art. #17887. <https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2024/17887/peerreview>

Reviewer A: Round 1

Date completed: 15 April 2024

Recommendation: **Accept** / Revisions required / Resubmit for review / Decline

Conflicts of interest: None

Does the manuscript fall within the scope of SAJS?

Yes/No

Is the manuscript written in a style suitable for a non-specialist and is it of wider interest than to specialists alone?

Yes/No

Does the manuscript contain sufficient novel and significant information to justify publication?

Yes/No

Do the Title and Abstract clearly and accurately reflect the content of the manuscript?

Yes/No

Is the research problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes/No

Are the methods described comprehensively?

Yes/No

Is the statistical treatment appropriate?

Yes/No/Not applicable/Not qualified to judge

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the research results?

Yes/Partly/No

Please rate the manuscript on overall contribution to the field

Excellent/Good/Average/Below average/Poor

Please rate the manuscript on language, grammar and tone

Excellent/Good/Average/Below average/Poor

Is the manuscript succinct and free of repetition and redundancies?

Yes/No

Are the results and discussion confined to relevance to the objective(s)?

Yes/No

The number of tables in the manuscript is

Too few/Adequate/Too many/Not applicable

The number of figures in the manuscript is

Too few/Adequate/Too many/Not applicable

Is the supplementary material relevant and separated appropriately from the main document?

Yes/No/Not applicable

Please rate the manuscript on overall quality

Excellent/Good/Average/Below average/Poor

Is appropriate and adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes/No

Is it stated that ethical approval was granted by an institutional ethics committee for studies involving human subjects and non-human vertebrates?

Yes/No/Not applicable

If accepted, would you recommend that the article receives priority publication?

Yes/No

Are you willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

Yes/No

Select a recommendation:

Accept / Revisions required / Resubmit for review / Decline

With regard to our policy on '[Publishing peer review reports](#)', do you give us permission to publish your anonymised peer review report alongside the authors' response, as a supplementary file to the published article? Publication is voluntary and only with permission from both yourself and the author.

Yes/No

Comments to the Author:

No comments.

Author response to Reviewer A: Round 1

No comments.

Reviewer B: Round 1

Not openly accessible under our [Publishing peer review reports](#) policy.

Reviewer E: Rounds 1 and 2

Not openly accessible under our [Publishing peer review reports](#) policy.