

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_73557
Title of the Manuscript:	Perceived effect of COVID-19 on the Health of Charcoal producers in the Guinea Savannah Agro-ecological Zone of Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Instead of describing the design the candidate described the sample and for that it is not good. The design should be fully described and should come after the approach before the setting. The design should be fully justified. Why did the author use the experimental design? Experimental designs are mostly used in Randomized Controlled Trials. Samples will be under experiment and the other sample will be control. To me the study is a mere quantitative study with a descriptive, contextual design. Therefore, the candidate needs to clarify this aspect.</p> <p>Sample size must be justified. What formula was used? Was a statistician consulted to get to the sample size? What was the sample inclusion and Exclusion criteria?</p> <p>Data collection: Instrument: Who designed the instrument? How was the validity and reliability – ensured? Who collected data, for how long and how? Who were the gate keepers at the sites? Was there any reimbursement of data collectors? How were the respondents recruited? Was the questionnaires self- administered to the respondents? Or were the questionnaires posted to the respondents? This information is not forthcoming from this study.</p> <p>Data analysis: How was data managed? And for how long?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Typographical errors- spelling, grammar / language editing</p> <p>Referencing is inconsistent. Please review the referencing technique and be consistent. Start from the second one to the last reference.</p> <p>All tables displayed must be described below each table and not vice-a-versa</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>This is an interesting study and I thank you for allowing me to review it. I n making corrections please also consider using the comments on the actual manuscript on the mark-up area.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Ethical consideration: This paper does not report on the ethics. No ethical Clearance; No Permission to use the human respondents from the Department of Health-Nigeria;</p> <p>No mention of an informed Consent that was signed;</p> <p>How was harm prevented from the respondents?</p> <p>How were the principles of anonymity, confidentiality, privacy, and justice ensured in this study?</p> <p>How were the COVID- 19 protocols ensured</p> <p>This is very essential if the study has human subjects as res[pondents.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Nonyaniso Trustina Nkutu</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Fort Hare, South Africa</i>