

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_127298
Title of the Manuscript:	Cholera in Zambia: Examining the Multisectoral Elimination Plan, 2025
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>		
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, it is suitable</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a comprehensive and well-structured overview of the study, effectively addressing the key aspects of the topic. Below is a summary of its few recommendations for refinement:</p> <p>Recommendations for Refinement:</p> <p>Conciseness in Objectives: The phrase "Our methodology includes a mixed-methods approach with data analysis from historical cholera records, climate variables, and socioeconomic factors from 1977 to the present" can be simplified to:</p> <p>"This study employs a mixed-methods approach, analyzing historical cholera records, climate data, and socioeconomic factors since 1977."</p> <p>Clarity in Goal Statement: Replace "with the goal of informing effective public health interventions" with a more concise version, such as:</p> <p>"to guide effective public health strategies."</p> <p>Global and Local Balance: Ensure equal emphasis on Zambia's local dynamics and global implications of the findings to make the study more universally relevant.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <p>Balance Across Sections: Some sections (e.g., "Traditional Oral Cholera Vaccine versus Plant-based Edible Cholera Vaccines") are more detailed than others (e.g., "Zambia's Cholera Elimination Plan"). Ensuring uniform depth of analysis across sections would enhance coherence.</p> <p>Clarity and Overlap: Overlapping themes, such as climate impacts discussed in both "Impact of Environmental Changes on Cholera" and other sections, could be streamlined to avoid redundancy.</p> <p>Figures and Data Integration:</p> <p>Thematic Expansion:</p> <p>While the focus on Zambia is crucial, a brief comparison with cholera control efforts in other regions could provide additional context and benchmarks.</p> <p>Section on Public Awareness:</p>	

Review Form 3

	Public education and behavior change communication are discussed briefly under "Conclusion and Future Perspective." Expanding on this in a dedicated subsection could strengthen the manuscript's practical implications.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness by providing a detailed and evidence-based analysis of the factors contributing to cholera in Zambia, including environmental changes, the WASH (water, sanitation, and hygiene) conditions, and the effectiveness of vaccination strategies. It integrates data from reliable sources such as the Zambia Demographic Health Survey and Global Task Force on Cholera Control to support its claims. Additionally, the manuscript outlines practical, well-supported recommendations for future interventions, such as the implementation of the Multisectoral Cholera Elimination Plan and the promotion of plant-based edible vaccines. This structured approach and reliance on empirical data contribute to the credibility and scientific integrity of the work.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chandramohan Karuppiah
Department, University & Country	Madurai Kamaraj University, India