
Review of Wikipedia Articles

The review is meant to facilitate further improvement of Wikipedia articles. Suggestions about the quality of a Wikipedia articles can be found at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Featured_article_criteria.

Please send your review in pdf and .doc format to Erica Litrenta: erica.litrenta@supsi.ch and Marta Pucciarelli: pucciarelli.marta@gmail.com

Name of the reviewer	Simone Sala
Affiliation	FAO
Title of the article	Water pollution

1. Quality of the Summary

Is the summary of the article a complete, thorough, and concise introduction to the topic? How do you think the summary could be improved? Which meaningful data are missing? Is there something that you find too much detailed for a general overview of the topic?

The summary provides a complete, thorough, and concise introduction to the topic. It could be improved by providing global and regional figures instead of examples from single countries (i.e. India, China and US). The data and information provided is not too much detailed for a general overview of the topic.

2. Structure and style of the article

Is the article properly presenting the topic for a general public? Does the article provide a complete and easy-to-navigate structure? Which paragraph would you add, unify or split into different parts? Please provide a list of suggestions. Is the article well written and understandable at a high school level?

The article is well written, adequately presents the topic to a general audience, and can be understood at a high school level. The navigation structure is clear and complete.

The paragraph on physical testing could be expanded, and the term “turbidity” should be linked to the related entry in Wikipedia.

3. Content

Is the article comprehensive of major facts related to the topic? Is the article adequately placing the subject in context? What does it miss? Please provide a list of topics you think should be included in the article (suggestions must be related to bibliography). Do you find that some arguments are not meaningful or representative of the topic for a general public. What should be deleted? Please explain why.

The article includes all the major facts related to the topic, and adequately places the subject in context. I think that all the topics are meaningful and representatives for a general public.

4. International and local dimension

Is the article neutral (it presents general and acknowledged views fairly and without bias)? Is the article representative of the international dimension and consolidated research about the topic? If applicable, does the article feature examples from all over the world (no localisms)? Please draft a list of what is missing with related references.

Despite having links to water pollution in different countries, most of the examples and pictures are from the United States. I would recommend including examples from other countries as well. Particularly, there are no examples from the European Union.

5. **References (essential to allow the articles to be improved)**

Is the list of publications comprehensive and updated? Does it list the fundamental monographs and papers? Please provide primary/generic and secondary/original resources which need to be included and suggest the list of publications which should be removed.

I consider the list of publications comprehensive, even though the references on current pollution figures [1-7] may be updated.