

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_101044
Title of the Manuscript:	Systems Thinking Utilizing The WHO Health Systems Framework – A Tertiary Hospital’s Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic in 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.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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>COVID 19 is an important area that needs more exploration hence, it seems the manuscript is important for scientific community</b></p> <p>2. <b>No, the title of the article is not suitable. There should not be abbreviation and further the title does not give any idea what the whole manuscript is about. Please write a suitable title.</b></p> <p>3. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>5. <b>No, the manuscript is not scientifically correct</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The author has to follow author's guideline while writing manuscript</li> <li>- Introduction part does not contain information about relevant subject</li> <li>- What about sample size calculation?</li> <li>- What about ethical consideration?</li> <li>- What about validity of questionnaire?</li> <li>- What about research design?</li> <li>- What about Data collection procedure?</li> <li>- What about consent from the participants?</li> </ul> <p>6. <b>The reference is not sufficient. More reference should be added.</b></p> <p><b>NOTE: apart from the above the additional comment is given in manuscript. Please find the additional comment</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is some issue with grammar and English quality. Please go thoroughly and do the needful</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

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

## Review Form 1.7

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Saibijaya Rijal</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Manmohan Technical University, Nepal</b>