

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_84884
Title of the Manuscript:	Accessing Healthcare Services During Lockdown in an African Semi-Urban Community: Influence of the Knowledge of COVID-19
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:

(<https://www.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The scope of the findings is limited as the study was primarily a descriptive study. There were a lot of proportions and percentages; however it was related to one measure only which was not defined fully. Some of the most salient findings, or difference in knowledge based on education and age can be explored in detail to give the study higher significance.</li><li>The central measure used was a questionnaire on 'COVID related knowledge'. However, very little information was provided about the questionnaire's development, validity/reliability, etc. More information is needed of the measures within Methodology</li><li>The categorization of people into two groups based on COVID knowledge is also not suited given that variability of scores will be lost. If participants got scores (in Interval form) based on their knowledge, better data analyses could be performed using those scores itself rather than reducing it to groups.</li></ul>	Correction made  Done revision
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>There were minor errors in English language usage in the manuscript. The errors were mostly related to tense (past/past participle/present) only. Most parts were written quite well.</li><li>The diagrams could have been done better. For Figure 1, it needs to be checked whether the data is more suited for pie charts instead.</li><li>Information given in Table 4 can also be reconsidered. It appears cluttered given the huge size of the matrix. Perhaps there is a better way to represent the same data.</li></ul>	Done
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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