

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_126943
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of Psychosocial Impacts of COVID-19 Pandemic on West Africans Based in Victoria Australia who Survived the 2014-16 Ebola Epidemic: The Methodological Approach
Type of the Article	Mixed-method research

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The manuscript describing the options of research methods will help the future researchers to receive the concepts of sequential approach and will eventually direct to underpin the method of final selection.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	The abstract could be improved by the addition of pros and cons of the methods described in the body part.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Mixed method can be described after the basic method (Quantitative and Qualitative)	
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 delivers scientifically sound information. The detail description of each of the methods proves the technical soundness of the contents. Moreover, the limitations and strengths of the methodological approaches will sharply justify the researcher's sights.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Repetition of word could be minimized by using synonyms or changing the basic structure of the sentences.	

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:	Jami Parvin Nitu
Department, University & Country	Pundra University of Science and Technology, Bangladesh