

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_130498
Title of the Manuscript:	SARS-COV- 2 Pandemic: Evaluating Early Public Health Intervention in Wuhan City, China
Type of the Article	

PART 1: 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. A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study's context is unclear. Highlight why this analysis remains relevant post-pandemic. For example, link early interventions to ongoing public health reforms, vaccine equity, or pandemic preparedness strategies.	The context has been defined as the pandemic preparedness strategies in the context of ravaging infectious diseases in the post – COVID era .I also reaffirmed that the threat of COVID -19 is still present in the modern era.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The tittle is suitable	
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.	In relevancewith the given comments the abstract can be improved	The abstract has been reconstructed to include contemporary realities of Marburg and Dengue mortalities. I have dwelled on the issue of disease preparedness and early intervention to prevent escalation of epidemics into pandemics.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Scientifically the manuscript is correct, but it would be great to follow reporting guidelines for the review	The reporting guidelines have been followed for the review
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<div><div>1. The study's context lacks clarity. Consider emphasizing its relevance in the post-pandemic era by linking early interventions to ongoing public health reforms, vaccine equity, and strategies for pandemic preparedness.</div><div>2. In line with the above, the historical context of previous coronavirus outbreaks (SARS and MERS) is well-detailed. Still, the connection to the current pandemic could be made clearer to highlight the relevance of past experiences in shaping current responses.</div><div>3. The article does not explicitly describe its methodological framework. It is unclear whether the study adopts a systematic review, scoping review, or another formal methodology. This omission undermines the research's reproducibility.</div><div>4. It does not mention how sources were selected, appraised, or excluded. For example:<div><div>a) Were the included sources peer-reviewed?</div><div>b) Was there a time limit for published articles (e.g., only studies from December 2019 onward)?</div><div>c) Were any biases in the data addressed (e.g., reliance on WHO-China reports)?</div></div></div><div>5. Although the article discusses migration and its impact on the spread of the virus, it does not employ any quantitative data analysis or modelling to substantiate these claims. This weakens the argument's empirical rigour.</div><div>6. The methodology does not account for interviews, surveys, or primary data collection, such as insights from healthcare workers or policymakers in Wuhan. This limits the depth of the analysis.</div><div>7. While the article mentions using PubMed and Google Scholar, it does not provide details about the specific keywords, search terms, or filters applied during the data-gathering process. This lack of transparency affects replicability.</div><div>8. The evaluation of public health interventions lacks a clear framework or metrics. For instance:<div><div>a) How was the success or failure of interventions measured?</div><div>b) Were other evaluation frameworks (e.g., WHO's Health Emergency Preparedness frameworks) considered?</div></div></div></div>	<div>I have defined the context clearly to link contemporary mortalities values of Marburg and Dengue and emphasised the need for pandemic preparedness and early intervention.</div> <div>Some analogies and connections between SARS and SARS – COV-2 virus have been added</div> <div>The Methodological framework has been explicitly highlighted</div> <div>The issue of inclusion criteria has been addressed and the limit of journal deployed has been highlighted.</div> <div>The limit of the journal reviewed have been spelt out</div> <div>The bias is not significant as China provided the data directly to WHO. But the possibility of bias could not be ruled out, hence,the perceived data bias would be added to the limitation.</div> <div>The impact and the numbers of migrants out of Wuhan had already been spelt out. Alternative hypothesis has already been discussed.</div> <div>Those quantitative data are unavailable, it would be accounted for in the limitation</div> <div>The specific keywords have been provided .</div> <div>This review article deploys primary data from China – WHO COVID reports and already published data. The primary surveys are not available. I will account for this in the Limitation of the Study.</div> <div>The specific keywords deployed for the search on PubMed and Google Scholar have been defined.</div> <div>The framework for measuring the failure of the intervention has been highlighted and explained.</div>

I have defined the context clearly to link contemporary mortalities values of Marburg and Dengue and emphasised the need for pandemic preparedness and early intervention.

Some analogies and connections between SARS and SARS – COV-2 virus have been added

The Methodological framework has been explicitly highlighted

The issue of inclusion criteria has been addressed and the limit of journal deployed has been highlighted.

The limit of the journal reviewed have been spelt out

The bias is not significant as China provided the data directly to WHO. But the possibility of bias could not be ruled out, hence,the perceived data bias would be added to the limitation.

The impact and the numbers of migrants out of Wuhan had already been spelt out. Alternative hypothesis has already been discussed.

Those quantitative data are unavailable, it would be accounted for in the limitation

The specific keywords have been provided .

This review article deploys primary data from China – WHO COVID reports and already published data. The primary surveys are not available. I will account for this in the Limitation of the Study.

The specific keywords deployed for the search on PubMed and Google Scholar have been defined.

The framework for measuring the failure of the intervention has been highlighted and explained.

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No ethical issue declared as the materials are wholly sourced from published material without any identifiable link to individuals .