

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_96538
Title of the Manuscript:	Challenges Faced by Healthcare Workers During the COVID-19 Pandemic in Prayagraj District of Uttar Pradesh
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.journalsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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)	Yes, by researching the link between social media and political communication, the author may able to share his/her latest findings, research papers, and achievements, scientists can increase the visibility and consequently the impact of their research. Yes, suitable. Yes. Yes. Yes. An updated reference. Overall, a well written journal. The author has demonstrated a clear and concise objective and research scope. No amendment needed.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	All sentences are well constructed and have varied structure and length. The author makes no errors in grammar, mechanics, and/or spelling.	
Optional/General comments	None.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Edwin Michael N. Muniandy
Department, University & Country	Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman, Malaysia