

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research</a>
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	

#### 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>

#### 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)
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript merits interest for the scientific community because it deals with a rather singular and not yet deeply explored issue—that is, the compounded psychosocial impacts due to multiple epidemics on migrant communities. In this respect, by focusing on West-African immigrants in Australia who experienced both the Ebola and COVID-19 pandemics, the study may provide insights that could inform mental health interventions and support services that are tailored to communities with layered traumatic experiences. This sequential explorative mixed-methods design strengthens rigor and depth in the findings, giving a broader perspective on how these crises have affected this particular population. Generally, I consider the manuscript to be methodologically tight due to clarity of purpose and its potential contribution to meaningful knowledge about public health, migration studies, and psychosocial research fields.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes. It is generally suitable as it captures the key elements of the study's focus—COVID-19's psychosocial impacts on West African survivors of Ebola now living in Australia.	
<b>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.</b>	It also allows a general view of the study, encompassing the focus of the research, target population, methodological approach, and its importance. However, it would be much better if it mentioned briefly some of the findings or the expected results to provide a better view regarding what this contribution might provide for readers. Certain terms, such as "paradigms" and "philosophical assumptions," would read better if there was streamlining in order to make the relevance clear, practical, and what might be expected from it. Suggested Changes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add Findings or Expected Outcomes: The mention of findings or what was expected to be enlightened briefly would make the abstract interesting to all.</li> <li>2. Motivation and Significance: Explain abstruse technical terms in terms of why this research is worth doing and what new insights it may provide.</li> <li>3. Length and Brevity: The description of the research paradigms and philosophical assumptions can be shortened to allow room for making a statement relating to implications for mental health practice or policy development.</li> </ol> The abstract, including these details, would be all-rounded and more captivating.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are also appropriate and in line with the focus of the study on methodology and philosophical underpinning	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically</b>	This manuscript is both scientifically robust and technically sound, for it avails a sound methodological design, particularly with regard to the usage of the sequential exploratory mixed-methods approach appropriate to complex psychosocial impacts across epidemics. The authors articulate the full reason	

### Review Form 3

<b>robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	for this choice and the pragmatist paradigm underlying it rightly in support of the synthesis both quantitatively and qualitatively.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes, the reference's are sufficient and recent.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, it's suitable for scholarly communications.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	<b>Kaleecharan Chelladurai</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Alagappa Institute of Management, Alagappa University, India</b>