

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_126668
Title of the Manuscript:	Scoping review of the literature on the psychosocial impacts Ebola virus epidemic on West Africans in Victoria
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.	The piece of work is one of the significant moves in the understanding of mental health status post infectious disease outbreak. I like this reading the manuscript since it is quite descriptive, data driven, scientifically compiled work.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	You may grammatically correct the title. Rest is ok	
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.	This is adequate.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Adequate	
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 talks about the fact and figures. The Systematic Literature Review is done as per the guiding principles. There is sufficient evidence in the discussion have been quoted, which proves the robustness of the work	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	A perspective review of deadly viral diseases: An era of viruses A perspective review of deadly viral diseases: An era of viruses International Journal of Basic & Clinical Pharmacology · Jul 6, 2021	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Very well written	

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:	Abhishek Sharma
Department, University & Country	C K Birla Hospital, India