Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRID_76711**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Study the knowledge on Prevention of COVID 19 Epidemic among Traditional Medical Practitioners**
Type of the 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)

Review Form 1.6

	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	1. The title should contain the region or country in which the research was carried out.
	
	2. In the introduction there is no explanation for objectives of the study and their relevance. It should include information about doctors who use traditional medicine, the concept of traditional medicine and some data on how this influences treatments and knowledges.
	
	3. Paragraphs 2 and 3 are copies of articles that use other references. Adjust the information and reference the articles correctly.
	
	4. The last paragraph of the introduction is not connected to the rest of the work. Try to readjust if really necessary, to show the reader why this information is needed within the research.
	
	5. It is necessary to place the reference of the last paragraph of the introduction. In addition, it is important to adapt texts taken from other places without copying them in full (paragraphs 1 to 5).
	
	6. The methodology lacks a lot of information.
	   a) Was it not necessary to approve the ethics committee? If not, there should at least be some justification for the reason
	   b) There is no information on how (online, in person...) and on which platform (if online), or where, the questionnaires were made. This is important information and should be included in the methodology.
	   c) What were the criteria for defining the responses as "very unsatisfactory", "unsatisfactory", "neutral", "satisfactory", "very satisfactory"? The evaluator should use some reference to fix these concepts, since personal opinions can influence the evaluation.
	   d) And why were two evaluations of the responses made? This is not clear in the paper.
	
	7. Try adjusting the images. The words are not visible.
	
	8. In table 1 it would be better to describe the characteristics of the regions it was considered like "urban", "suburban" and "rural" in the legend.
	
	9. When you describe "Recoding in to different variable and Analysis each question" it was not clear how the issues were assessed. Try describe this part a little better in methodology so that readers can understand the results of the graphics.
	
	10. Do you have any justification for using a few participants? Was it easy to get the answers to the questionnaire? It is important to highlight this information in the discussion as limitations of the study.	

Minor REVISION comments		

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	It is best to put the objectives at the end of the introduction rather than a separate topic. You can pay more attention to the relevance of your work.	

	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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Mariana Raquel da Cruz Vegian*
Department, University & Country	*Sao Paulo State University (Unesp), Brazil*