

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_95338
Title of the Manuscript:	Perception of health risks associated with the use of the water and fish from the River Nyong, Cameroon
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The manuscript important for scientific if major revision will be made according to the comments provided from reviewers. 2. It's better if the title modified as " <i>Communities' Perception of health risks associated with utilizing the water and fish from the River Nyong, Cameroon</i> " 3. The abstract needs more modification (i.e, no need to provide sub-title) 4. The sub-section needs minor revision 5. Yes 6. The references are mostly recent	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is was no problem, but it needs the coherence of ideas.	
Optional/General comments	- The introduction part could have clearly state the problem statement, objectives of the manuscript. - Since the discussion is somewhat shallow, the author should revise the manuscript. - The output/ results have to clearly discussed.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Siraj Abduro Abdulahi
Department, University & Country	Madda Walabu University, Ethiopia