

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_96894
Title of the Manuscript:	Demographic and Public Health Characteristics of COVID-19 Mortality Cases in Rivers State, Nigeria –A Retrospective Cohort Study
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.journalajrid.com/index.php/AJRID/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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript provides a significant contribution to the scientific research community and I declare that which is good.</p> <p>2. The manuscript is written about Demographic and Public Health Characteristics of COVID-19 Mortality Cases in Rivers State, Nigeria. Which is suitable for scientific community.</p> <p>3. The abstract is clearly written but need to clear more detailed.</p> <p>4. The manuscript structured is good but need some correction.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references is sufficient but need some corrections</p> <p>This manuscript is describing about mortality cases but there are several things which might be adjusted.</p> <p>Abstract: The abstract describes the mortality rate and find out some reasons where men have died a number of highest percentage and they told two main diseases they have. Most of them are elder person. But the author did not mention about the total sample size they have collected and didn't mention it was monthly or daily. There is no specific time about the data collection. The use retrospective study, but didn't use any particular method to describe the method. Some symptoms have been described as a main problem but how many have them the problem, they didn't describe the percentage. Age was main point in this research but is it happened only for the elderly people, the didn't provide anything towards it.</p> <p>Introduction The use the past information but didn't update it. There are no details about spread of covid-19 in a river site. Children and adult are being affected or not they didn't provide the information. Introduction should be clearer related to the topic and describe the way use by the river site. Why they have been attacked only these river site and the procedure the reached the destination.</p> <p>Methods In the method section it is not clear about the study area. There should be a specific identification of these are which is not mentioned. The population size is mentioned but didn't describe the current population on time. The data source is not mentioned clearly. Is there any missing value or not they not describe and they didn't the describe the procedure of data transformation. They also not mentioned how they tackle the categorised data.</p> <p>Results What is the significance of your result? Please explain clearly. Graphical Presentation might be good for better visualization.</p> <p>Discussion In the discussion section they just describe the age and diseases but not discuss the evidence about the mortality rate was higher.</p> <p>Conclusion Conclusion is not associated properly with abstract, please make the conclusion more suitable for extracting the key points and adding to the abstract content</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Point 1: The references are not used correctly. Its present the error in the citation.</p> <p>Point 2. Graphical presentation and table contents should be more clear and specific words need to choose.</p> <p>Point 3. Graphical presentation needs to be more visualisation and colourful</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Point 1. Font should be correct.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Selim Mondol
Department, University & Country	Begum Rokeya University, Bangladesh