

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_101538
Title of the Manuscript:	Case Reporting Appraisal of Notifiable Infectious disease: A systematic Review
Type of the 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.journalajrn.com/index.php/AJRNH/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The chosen field is important from a scientific point of view. The quality and the scientific soundness is fairly good. The title of the article is appropriate. The abstract of the article is clear and well established with clear and concise language. Sections and subsections in the text are not numbered correctly. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct References are not sufficient and mostly not correctly represented. For a review article it should include at least 50 references. Citations in the text do not comply with the requirements of the magazine's editorial guidelines. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The entire article should be checked for minor grammatical errors, punctuation, etc.;	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The subject is good, the approach is pragmatic and precise and the results are clear, well systematized and bring useful information to. I recommend publishing it after reviewing the manuscript.	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zagrai Gavrilă
Department, University & Country	Saint Sylvester Secondary School, University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Cluj-Napoca, Romania