

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_99891
Title of the Manuscript:	The unpreparedness of a health district in the face of an epidemic, the case of Covi19 and the impact on neurosurgery activities
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.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/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"> 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, this manuscript is definitely important for the scientific community. Of course, if its defects are fixed.</p> <p>Yes it's good. But in my opinion, it is better to mention the descriptiveness of the research and also the case study in the subtitle.</p> <p>The abstract is good. But it is very flawed when it comes to methodology. Also, there is not enough expression to the community, data collection tools and methods.</p> <p>Yes, They are appropriate. But the explanation of each subsection is not enough.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is generally correct. But it is acceptable as a summary report. Because it has only been described in a simple way and no special tools and methods have been used to prove the desired hypothesis.</p> <p>I think the references used are sufficient for the needs of this manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes, it is suitable.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	While thanking the researcher for his efforts, I strongly recommend that the goal/question or hypothesis be clearly defined to strengthen the manuscript. The variables should be defined accurately and the question should be answered with appropriate tools and methods or the correctness/falseness of the hypothesis should be proved. If only a descriptive analysis is done or a case report is considered, it is necessary to clarify.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Farzad Mirshamsi
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University, Iran