

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	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 (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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">This manuscript holds value for the scientific community as it provides insights into the psychosocial impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on migrants in Australia.It enriches our understanding of how past traumatic experiences shape coping mechanisms and psychological resilience during subsequent crises.It underscores the importance of culturally sensitive approaches in public health policy.Some readers may find the mixed-methods approach complex, though it enhances the study's depth and reliability by combining quantitative and qualitative insights	Thanks.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article effectively conveys the study's main focus. However, a more concise and engaging title might enhance clarity and appeal. Here's a possible alternative: "The Dual Epidemic Experience: Psychosocial Impact of COVID-19 on Ebola Survivors Among Australian-based West African Migrants"	Appreciated. Title has been edited as suggested
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>The abstract is quite comprehensive. It addresses the psychosocial impact of COVID-19 on West African migrants in Australia who previously endured the Ebola epidemic, highlighting the study's unique population and cross-sectional mixed-methods approach. However, a few refinements could improve clarity and focus:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Clarify Findings and Potential Impact: Including expected findings or potential insights in the abstract could help readers understand the study's contribution more directly. For instance, mentioning specific psychosocial themes or mental health outcomes the study aims to reveal would add value.Shorten Methodology Description: The abstract includes details about specific scales and data collection tools, which might be better suited for the methods section. Simplifying this part to mention only the cross-sectional mixed-methods approach would make space for more findings or impact statements.Highlight Broader Relevance: Adding a sentence on the broader implications (e.g., potential contributions to migrant health policies or mental health interventions) could emphasize the study's value to global health and migrant well-being. <p>By making these changes, the abstract would become more impactful and engaging for a wide scientific audience.</p>	Noted with thanks The abstract has been revised and restructured as advised
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appear appropriate for a research article.	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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">It employs a well-defined mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative data collection, which strengthens the validity of its findings.The choice of validated scales, such as the Kessler Psychological Distress Scale (K-6) and Brief-Cope, indicates methodological rigor and allows for reliable measurement of psychosocial impacts.Additionally, the study's specific focus on a vulnerable population with unique prior trauma (Ebola survivors) adds depth and relevance, providing valuable insights into how cumulative traumatic experiences influence responses to new stressors like COVID-19.The manuscript's design and methodological approach suggest it is a technically sound contribution to migrant and mental health research.	Thank you, very much for the constructive feedback
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are sufficient. Adding more recent studies that examine migrant mental health specifically in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic would provide a more comprehensive background. References on long-term mental health effects of surviving infectious disease epidemics, particularly Ebola, would further strengthen the manuscript's foundation. Adding recent literature on coping mechanisms in response to pandemics or quarantine situations could enhance the discussion on coping strategies.	(12.)Wolfers LN, Lüpken LM, Schimmel M, Utz S, Nabi RL, Gaiser F: Coping with the COVID-19 Pandemic by Using Media: Extending the Coping Goodness-of-Fit Hypothesis to Media Use. <i>Communication Studies</i> 2024, 75(5):712-732. (32.)Bourmistrova NW, Solomon T, Braude P, Strawbridge R, Carter B: Long-term effects of COVID-19 on mental health: A systematic review. <i>Journal of Affective Disorders</i> 2022, 299:118-125.

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Ensuring consistent use of terminology, especially when discussing psychosocial impacts and coping strategies, would improve. Overall, with minor edits for flow and conciseness, the language quality is strong and well-suited for publication.	Thanks.
Optional/General comments	<div>1. This study is highly relevant</div> <div>2. Methodological rigor strengthens the manuscript by combining quantitative measures with qualitative insights from interviews.</div> <div>3. The manuscript includes adequate references.</div> <div>4. The language quality is appropriate for academic communication and ensure consistent terminology when discussing psychosocial impacts.</div>	Thanks.

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	