Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJTDH_86850**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A Scoping Analysis of Theories, Models, and Standard Operating Procedures for the COVID-19 Pandemic in Uganda**
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.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/editorial-policy)

Review Form 1.6

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	• Which document? • • It makes no sense or consistency with the above. • • Improve writing, it seems a synthesis. • • This research is not aimed at analyzing the effectiveness or benefits of vaccination, so these recommendations should be omitted as they are not behind a scientific analysis. • • This premise must be updated, and when talking about "theories", it should be mentioned which theories or theoretical postulates are being referred to. • • It is not clear what the purpose of the study is, nor is there a development in the introduction related to the title of this document. • • Series of observational experiments? Care must be taken with the terms: case series, experimental studies, observational studies. • • Greater clarity and specificity should be made about the "materials and methods" used in the development of this study. • • The type of study and design used is unclear. • • which? Or propose a reference so that the reader can determine which theories are alluded to. • • They must review the literature carefully, because it is not absolute that SARS-CoV-2 is transmitted only by air, and it seems that they say so. • • Reference some of them. • • Define each acronym used. • • Reference of this postulate. • • Mechanic ventilation. • • Update and reference according to recent information. • • Which? Reference. • • Update with available information. • • It is important to remember that it is necessary to refer to these guidelines, since it is a research study and requires scientific support, for example, why a person should be isolated for a certain period of time. • • Reference scientific supports. • • The contemplation of the religious approach in this document should be omitted, it is not opportune. Another separate study could be developed where religious perspectives on the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic are developed. • • There is so much content intermingled in the document that even reading the conclusions without a clear objective is difficult. • • In case of having different conclusions, the ideas should be ordered and separated by paragraphs, in order to make a better reading. • • They must adjust the document to the format and according to the guidelines of the magazine, it does not comply with the established guidelines.	
Minor REVISION comments	• And Asia and Oceania? • • They can mention the sequence of vaccines, Pfizer, Moderna, Others. • • It is not necessary to put: "…basically quantitative", it is quantitative or it is not, there should be no ambiguity. • • Review other recent mathematical modelling. • • You are overusing the Nannyonga, et al. reference, be careful not to plagiarize. • • Define whether this premise needs to be updated for the current date. • • A structural or graphic design could be put in place of such photographs that belong to a specific place and space. • • In the same way, it is opportune that the topics be addressed by separate documents, since too much divergence is created, the hilarity is lost as this article is constituted. Otherwise, the titles and subtitles could be organized much better, since the way in which this study is carried out creates confusion.	
Optional/General comments	The authors are encouraged to continue working on the research. Likewise, that they accept the recommendations and corrections for the benefit of scientific development.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Juan Camilo Quintero Gomez**
Department, University & Country	**Colombia**