

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_99305
Title of the Manuscript:	OUTBREAK OF CHOLERA IN GHANA; A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW FROM 2010 TO 2020
Type of the Article	Review 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> )

### 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> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community because is historical, expository and rich in data and statistics that could be utilised for decision-making.</p> <p>2. The title is quite suitable.</p> <p>3. The Abstract, though comprehensive, contains too much information on methods and unnecessary subtitles. It should further be summarized and the subtitles (Background, Method, Results and Conclusion) expunged.</p> <p>4. The structure and subsections are appropriate. However, <b>Recommendations</b> should be added as a subsection.</p> <p>5. Since similar works have been published in peer-review journals, this manuscript can be accepted as scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient, but they should be arranged in a particular order, preferably, alphabetical.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. The number of cases reported in the Results (20,120) do not correspond with that on Table 1 (60,031); and no explanation was given.</p> <p>2. Cholera is a bacteria disease whereas "Canker" describes a fungal disease and hence, is not appropriate as used in page 13, para.1.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ijeoma Chibueze Victor
Department, University & Country	Nigeria