



THE NIGERIAN HEALTH JOURNAL

Editorial Office: Nigerian Medical Association Secretariat, Km 16 East-West Road
(near Obiri-Ikwerre)

P. O, Box 12184, Port Harcourt, Rivers State.

Website: www.tnhjph.com; Email: info@tnhjph.com; Phone: 09159602776

Reviewers' Feedback

Reviewer's Name:	
E-Mail:	
Affiliation:	
Country:	
Manuscript Number:	
Title:	
Date Sent to Reviewer:	
Date Expected from Reviewer:	

Reviewers should endeavour to provide examples and evidence for responses where necessary, and not simply answer yes or no in all sections. This Review format is only a guide as such, reviewers can provide added information which they consider relevant.

The responses and comments of the reviewers should be typed in the columns provided:

Topic and content: Is the topic relevant for the journal?	
Is the work original? (If not, please give references)	
Title: Does the title reflect the contents of the article	
Abstract: To what extent does the abstract reflect aspects of the study: background, objectives, methods, results and conclusions?	
Methodology: To what extent is the study methods and design appropriate and adequate for the objectives?	
Ethical Consideration: Are issues related to ethics, adequately described? (For human studies, was ethical approval obtained?)	
Analysis and results: Are the methods of data analysis appropriate?	
Is further review by a statistician necessary?	
Discussion: How well are the key findings stated and discussed?	
+Are the implications of these findings clearly explained?	
Conclusion(s): Do the results justify the conclusion(s)?	
References: Are the references up to date, appropriate and in recommended style?	

Writing: Is the paper clearly written in line with the appropriate reporting guidelines/statements?	
---	--

Rating the reviewed article based on the following criteria: (1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Fair) (4 = poor).

Originality:	
Contribution to the Field:	
Technical Quality:	
Clarity Of Presentation:	
Depth Of Research:	

Recommendations: Please select one of the following recommendations:

1. Accept: no required edits; submission may be published as originally submitted; less feedback is expected for an “accept” decision	
2. Minor revision: mild revision suggested; “accept” decision will follow satisfactory response to comments of the reviewers.	
3. Major revisions: significant revisions required; resubmissions will be sent back to the reviewers to ascertain desired improvements. “accept” decision will follow only after reviewers’ affirmation of corrections. If you choose this option, are you available to review the revised paper? Yes/No	
4. Reject: submission declined; no opportunity to resubmit in current form	

Reviewers are expected to state any relevant competing interests they may have during submission of their reviews and can object to a request to review if such competing interest can influence the review process.