

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_126944
Title of the Manuscript:	Psychosocial impact of COVID-19 as perceived by Australian- based West Africans who survived the 2014-2016 Ebola epidemic in West Africa: Study Introduction
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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>
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.	This manuscript addresses a crucial and timely issue: the psychosocial impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on a vulnerable population. By focusing on West African migrants who have previously experienced the Ebola epidemic, the study offers a unique perspective on the compounding effects of trauma and adversity. The findings of this research can contribute to the development of targeted mental health interventions and support services for this population.	Thanks.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Psychosocial impact of COVID-19 as perceived by Australian-based West Africans who survived the 2014-2016 Ebola epidemic in West Africa," is clear and concise. It accurately reflects the study's focus and scope.	Thanks.
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.	The abstract provides a good overview of the study's objectives, methods, and expected outcomes. However, it could benefit from a more detailed description of the qualitative methods used for data collection and analysis. Additionally, a brief mention of the key findings or anticipated results could be included.	Thanks. The method section of abstract has been edited – e.g. "...cross-sectional mixed methods study. Qualitative components were designed to be individual interviews, while quantitative would utilize Statistical analyses are proposed to involve mixed methods"
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure is appropriate, with clear subsections that facilitate understanding.	Thanks.
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 demonstrates a strong foundation in relevant literature and employs appropriate research methods. The proposed use of mixed-methods design, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches, is sound and will provide a comprehensive understanding of the research question. The inclusion of measures like the Kessler Psychological Distress Scale (K-6) and the Brief-Cope (28) adds rigor to the study.	Thanks.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references appear to be sufficient and recent. However, a more thorough review of the literature, particularly on the long-term impacts of infectious disease outbreaks on mental health, could be beneficial.	Thanks. The suggestion for "...a more thorough review of the literature, particularly on the long-term impacts of infectious disease outbreaks on mental health, could be beneficial" is noted and already done. The robust/thorough literature review associated with this work is already in two separate manuscripts being peer-reviewed alongside this.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	While the language quality is generally good, some minor grammatical and stylistic errors may need to be addressed. A careful review by a native English speaker or professional editor can help improve the overall clarity and readability of the manuscript.	Noted with thanks. Editing has been done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	