

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRID_97383</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>“Prevalence of Anxiety During COVID-19 Pandemic: A Comprehensive Review on Scientific Literatures”</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### **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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b>	1. Yes  2. Yes  3. The manuscript title is ok. The abstract is comprehensive. I suggest language editing to the abstract and the whole of the manuscript. Some significant outcomes should be added to the abstract. The review article attempts to identify the effects of the linkage COVID-19 pandemic on the mental health of different groups and communities. The sources of the review are reliable and sufficient.  4. The introduction should end with significant review implication that will enhance the study rationale and arguments more useful and wide. Thus, the introduction needs minor improvements. Thus, the author/s should sharp the study arguments. Use of subheadings in the methods section is suggested. Some relevant inclusion and exclusion criteria may be added to this section. Use of smaller paragraph may make the manuscript more readable and comprehensive. The results may be presented using subheadings that make it more comprehensive. The discussion is good. I suggest to add detailed implications of the review especially research, practice and policy dimensions. It also needs modifications. New findings should be highlighted. Interpretations of the results need to be improved. Directions for future research may also be added to make the article more useful.  5. Yes  6. Yes	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Minor language editing is suggested.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The study topic is time and relevant. Its design, methods, and presentations are also good. The study results can make important contributions to the field of knowledge.	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gyanesh Kumar Tiwari
Department, University & Country	Dr. Hari Singh Gour Central University, India