

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_101588
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE AND ASSOCIATED FACTORS OF SARS-COV-2 AMONG STUDENTS IN PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General comments <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The study is generally good and it sort to determine the prevalence of COVID 19 and associated factors among students at private institution in Rivers state, Nigeria. The research write has logical flow. b) The abstract has outlined important parameters, but the problem is not coming out clear as well as the implications. The research has the opportunity to modify the abstract by adding two or three lines. Again, I suggest the phrase 'associated factors" should be added on Keywords c) On Methodology, the questionnaire instrument and biological collection of samples were both administered to humans. Although the procedure of testing and the technique for biological collection of samples were explained, the questionnaire instrument was not explained. In fact, it was mentioned in passing. There is need to explain and justify the use of the questionnaire. d) The sample technique of the biological collection of samples states that, I quote, "Each participant was allocated a unique code to enable the questionnaire to be linked to the biological sample taken, to avoid inaccurate data entry and misinterpretation". I do not see how readers would follow through this up to the results section. e) Again, the results section mentions that there is 98.6% negative and 1.4% positive, showing that COVID 19 prevalence among student is 1.4%. Since the questionnaire was linked to the samples taken through codes, then I suggest a Table of results should show that scenario. So that a trail of results will add to 98.6% negative and 1.4% positive. Further, comparisons are needed to say for example, which age group is more COVID 19 prevalent than the other etc f) Still on results section, Table 2, figures that depict percentages should be captured as percentages and not in brackets only. g) The discussion is good. However, improvements are needed, especially for the researcher to add his/her thoughts on what previous authors found out vis-a-vis his/her findings. Otherwise, the discussion risks becoming a collection of literature. h) The conclusion is not complete. I suggest the author should summarize the main points of the research and state the implications, i) Like any other research, limitations should be mentioned. 4. Track changes in the manuscript. See the comments on the manuscript well. 5. Result The paper can be published after corrections have been made. 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Tonderai Mathende
Department, University & Country	Zimbabwe