

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	

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This article uses both qualitative and quantitative approach in analysing and understanding the subject matter. This study may provide a more holistic understanding on the subject matter. The reliability and validity of the research are higher, since both methods are deployed. Therefore, the generalisability	
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.	Yes. Nicely written and comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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 article was systematically organized by the author. The focus of the article was explained in a scientific and philosophical context. This article was technically sound and scientifically robust as it deploys a very detailed methodological approach in relation to the topic.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes. The references were provided sufficiently and recent	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes. The language used are clear and concise, the sentences are formed in an academic standard.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Overall. Clear and concise. Thorough explanation. No revision needed.	

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:	Muhammad Nasrul bin Mohamed Noor
Department, University & Country	International Islamic University Malaysia, Malaysia