

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Original Manuscript_IJTDH_118108</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Spillage of Akosombo and Kpong dams in Ghana: perspectives on socio-economic and public health impacts on affected populations and proposed mitigation strategies</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1-Yes. This manuscript is important for scientific community.</p> <p>2-The title is suitableç.</p> <p>3-Yes. Abstract is enough comporehensive.</p> <p>4-Yes. Subsections and structures are appropriate. One thing is method and conclusion could be deleted from abstract and these could be moved to main structure of paper.</p> <p>5-Yesi I think that.</p> <p>6-References are recent and sufficient.</p> <p>7-Paper needs to be minor corrections for language.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1-Needs minor corrections for English quality.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Abdullah Murat Tuncer
Department, University & Country	Turkey

Review Form 1.7