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|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | 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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | The study is both timely and relevant to public health discussions, research, and policymaking due to recurring public health crises due to increasing global migration trends. The study also provides valuable insights into examining the psychosocial impact of pandemics on migrant communities, particularly West Africans in Australia. Moreover, the study fills in the contextual gap of existing literature as it delves into migrant communities which are less often than not talked about in relation to public health crises. In addition, there is a lack of comparative studies on the impacts of two or more public health crises throughout history which makes the study significant and relevant as it compares experiences of the public between the Ebola Virus Disease (EVD) and the COVID-19 pandemic. Hence, the manuscript contributes to both academic and policymaking on mental health, coping strategies, and social support systems for migrant populations. | Noted and thanks. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | While the title is descriptive, there could be refinements to it to make that that is clear and concise. Redundancies could be observed on the title making the title a bit lengthy, such as, “a narrative summary, conclusion, and recommendations," which are expected components of any research paper.” I would recommend revising the title to “Psychosocial Impacts of the Ebola Virus Disease and COVID-19 on Australian-Based West Africans: A Comparative Study”. This streamlined title enhances readability without compromising its ability to convert the study’s focus. It also maintains the core elements of the research focus on EVD, COVID-19, and the target population who are the West African migrants in Australia. Lastly, it stresses the nature of the study which is a comparative study and it promotes engagement and accessibility towards readers by avoiding unnecessary wording. | Noted and action taken. |
| 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. | The abstract presents a comprehensive summary and outline of the research, background, objectives, methods, key findings, and conclusion. However, it could be refined by clearly stating the seven research questions (7-RQ) to provide better context for the study's objectives. The abstract could briefly mention a mixed-methods approach to put emphasis on the use of qualitative interviews and quantitative survey analysis. Moreover, the abstract could be enhanced by including statistical details or qualitative coding methods, such as how the thematic analysis was conducted or how prevalence percentages were calculated. In addition, there should be a discussion of the significance of findings, particularly how past EVD experiences influenced coping strategies during the COVID-19 pandemic. Lastly, while the abstract is easy to understand, the choice of words could be revised for clarity and conciseness, ensuring each section of the abstract efficiently communicates essential information. | Noted and action taken. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here. | The study is scientifically accurate wherein the researcher ensures reliability and reproducibility. It follows a sequential mixed-methods approach, employing validated tools such as the Trauma History Screen and Kessler-6 Psychological Distress Measure. Moreover, the study is scientifically accurate which could help academics, policymakers, and practitioners replicate it for future studies. Additionally, conclusions are drawn from empirical information which could contribute meaningfully to academic literature. Lastly, the study prevents ethical and academic misconduct which could help maintain integrity in the scientific community.  However, the following areas require clarification:   * Kindly specify how the qualitative coding framework conducted or are there any software utilized for data analysis. * Clearly state whether statistical significance was tested and provide details on the analysis performed. * Strengthen the discussion by explicitly linking findings to survey results to enhance coherence that are drawn from empirical information which could contribute meaningfully to academic literature. | Noted thanks. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | While studying psychosocial impact of public health issues on migrant communities can still be considered as uncharted waters, the references used in the study are generally adequate and relevant. The study could benefit if there is an integration of most recent literature on COVID-19’s psychosocial impact on migrant communities, particularly from 2023–2024. Despite this, the accuracy and depth of the study are still valid given how references were made to support and validate the findings of the study which is vital for public health preparation. | Action taken. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Please review your methodology and results sections. it needs improvement on its readability. However, aside from this, the language is generally clear and with minor grammatical issues. | Action taken. |
| Optional/General comments | The study has a comprehensive and logical structure making its findings relevant to the scientific community. However, its impact could be enhanced by adding discussions on the implications for mental health policy and intervention policy. Lastly, the ethical considerations section should explicitly state whether approval was obtained or why it was not required. | Action taken |
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| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | I do not see any ethical issues on the manuscript. |  |