

### Review Form 3

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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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 research is centred around ebola virus which can be the new threat after COVID-19, the study addresses various issues revolving around EVD hence is of great importance to the scientific community	
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 it is 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.	Yes is sound and robust, further the methodology in particular has been detailing and quite illustrative	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, No further suggestions	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Yatin talwar
Department, University & Country	PILBS, India