

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_113208
Title of the Manuscript:	Covid-19 Anxiety among Students and Teachers and Compliance to Prevention Protocols in Selected Schools in Delta State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	

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? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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, the manuscript is important for the scientific community because it analyses from a statistical point of view certain correlations between the fear of the COVID 19 infection and certain attitudes among students and teachers in a department in Nigeria.</p> <p>The title is appropriate.</p> <p>The abstract summarizes the content of the manuscript very well</p> <p>Each section of the manuscript is very well presented. The Introduction section presents in detail the state of affairs during the pandemic, recounted in many scientific works that the authors adequately cite. Moreover, the authors make very relevant comments about the anxiety related to the COVID 19 infection and its impact on economic life, but especially on education.</p> <p>The hypotheses of the study are presented clearly and concisely.</p> <p>The material and methods section presents in detail the sampling protocol, the statistical methods used and the samples chosen. The results are very well presented both in the tables and in the text. The discussions are relevant by comparing the results obtained with other reports in the field.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>The references are appropriate</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language is adequate</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Stan Florin Gheorghe
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania