

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_101588</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>PREVALENCE AND ASSOCIATED FACTORS OF SARS-COV-2 AMONG STUDENTS IN PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. <b>Yes, It is important because SARS-COV-2 is still new to the world and information of this study may be useful to all parts of the world.</b> 2. <b>Yes, it is okay.</b> 3. <b>In abstract section, 431 participants who are tested for SARS-COV-2 are from among 450 participants among whom 450 questionnaires were distributed or both are different. This needs to be clarified. However, method and material section after introduction section has clearly mentioned that 431 participants have been randomly chosen which make no sense of using 450 questionnaires as mentioned in abstract section. You are suggested to correct it or clarify it properly.</b> 4. <b>It can be checked by editor or editor in chief as per the journal. However in general, it is fine.</b> 5. <b>Yes, it is scientifically correct.</b> 6. <b>Yes, references are sufficient and recent.</b> 7. <b>Additional suggestion: Authors are suggested to attached the questionnaire tool and clearly need to mention in the manuscript that the tool is valid and reliable after their testing or if the tool has been made by someone else then it has be cited along with permission from the creator of the tool.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Some minor English correction is needed.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	It can be accepted after minor modification as suggested.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bikash Sah</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>B.P. Koirala Institute of Health Sciences, Nepal</b>