

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_121401
Title of the Manuscript:	HEALTH STATUS OF HOUSEHOLDS AND ACCESS TO HEALTH FACILITIES IN NIGERIA: INTERROGATING THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS PARTICIPATION
Type of the Article	Research 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>I appreciate this manuscript for its comprehensive approach, robust methodology, and actionable insights. It provides a comprehensive analysis of the health status and access to health facilities in Nigeria, examining both public and private sector participation. This gives valuable insight into the healthcare landscape of Africa's most populous country. However, the writing could be more concise in some sections to improve readability (I specifically state below in the text in the review.)</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article does capture the main themes of the study, it could be improved for clarity and conciseness. I would recommend to authors consider modifying the title: "Public and Private Healthcare in Nigeria: Evaluating Household Health Status and Access to Facilities." In my opinion the revised title still conveys the essence of the research while being more concise and potentially more engaging for readers.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is fairly comprehensive, covering the main aspects of the study including its purpose, methodology, findings, and conclusion. I recommend the authors consider revising the abstract. However, there are a few areas where it could be improved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include a brief statement on the background or context of the study, explaining why this research is necessary. - For me is the abstract is quite long and could benefit from some condensing, particularly in the results section. Consider focusing on the most significant findings rather than listing all coefficients. - I think that the sentence "In all, the most important finding (from R-Squared and F -- static) is the significance of the explanatory variables in explaining the variations in the dependent variable" could be rephrased more clearly. - I recommend to mention the specific statistical method used (Ordinary Least Squares) in the methodology section of the abstract - I recommend to add a brief sentence on the implications of the findings for policy and practice. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's structure and subsections are generally appropriate and follow a logical flow typical of scientific papers but I have some suggestions for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I recommend to add a separate "Methods" section before "Presentation of Results" to detail data collection and analysis procedures. - The section research methodology is concise but could benefit from more detail on data collection methods and analysis techniques. A subsection on ethical considerations might be a valuable addition. - Consider separating "Results" and "Discussion" into two distinct sections for improved clarity. The combination of results and discussion in one section is acceptable, but separating them might improve clarity. - I think that the division into summary of findings, conclusion, and recommendations is appropriate. - Consider adding a "Future Research Directions" subsection to the Concluding Remarks. 	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The study employs a well-structured research design, clearly stating its objectives, research questions, and hypotheses. The methodology is scientifically sound, utilizing a quantitative approach with data collected from a representative sample across six geopolitical zones in Nigeria. The use of Ordinary Least Squares regression for data analysis is appropriate for the type of data and research questions being addressed. I think that there are areas where the manuscript could be improved (such as more detailed explanation of methodological choices or limitations), overall it presents a scientifically robust and technically sound investigation into health status and access to health facilities in Nigeria.-</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The manuscript includes a substantial number of references, which is commendable. While there are some recent references (up to 2024), many of the citations are from older sources. For a rapidly evolving field like healthcare, especially considering the impact of recent global events like the</p>	

Review Form 3

:	COVID-19 pandemic, more recent references would strengthen the study's relevance. The references cover a good range of topics, including health economics, healthcare access, and public-private partnerships.	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Overall, while the language quality is generally acceptable for scholarly communication, a thorough proofreading and editing process focusing on these areas would significantly enhance the paper's clarity and professional presentation. This would ensure that the valuable content and research findings are communicated as effectively as possible to the academic audience. For example in the article there are occasional grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that could be improved. For example, in the abstract: "It is with the aim of making health and health care delivery accessible, available and affordable, inclusive of all the members of the households without discriminations." This could be rephrased for better clarity. I have found some inconsistencies in formatting and style throughout the document. For instance, the use of abbreviations is not always consistent (e.g., "SDG" vs "SDGs"). There are some instances where punctuation could be improved or corrected. For example, misplaced or missing commas in complex sentences. In my opinion some sentences are overly long and complex, which can make them difficult to follow. Breaking these into shorter, more focused sentences would improve readability.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>I appreciate that the paper follows a clear structure with well-defined sections. The introduction effectively sets up the context and relevance of the study. I think the literature review is comprehensive, covering key concepts and previous research. After reviewing it, I can say that the study provides valuable insights and has significant potential, but requires major revisions to address methodological limitations, increase explanatory power, and improve transparency regarding ethical considerations and potential conflicts of interest. Following these revisions, the manuscript could make a more substantial contribution to understanding and improving health care access and outcomes in Nigeria.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Andrea Seberini
Department, University & Country	University of Matej Bel, Slovakia