

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_96343
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in sellers at two main Goma markets in the eastern Democratic Republic of Congo.
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) The manuscript is important for the scientific community given the importance of the topic addressed, even with the limitations that the study exhibits in terms of results. Unaddressed variables are observed that can contribute to the data obtained, for example, population genetics related to immunity, as stated by the authors of the research themselves, demography, and sociocultural factors, etc. Being suggests reviewing a sentence that does not have a bibliographic citation, for which evidence of review of the manuscript by an anti-plagiarism system is provided.</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) the title is appropriate under the subject matter.</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? the summary is clear enough regarding the central topic dealt with in the research.</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, since in principle its writing and presentation is based on a template on which the author(s) developed.</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Despite some elements that were left out of the study, as noted by the authors themselves, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. the references are sufficient and recent.</p> <p>in the introduction you should open the paragraphs as these are very long.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>the quality of the language is adequate, however, it is important that the writing is done in the third person</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jairo Eduardo Márquez Díaz
Department, University & Country	Cundinamarca University, Colombia