



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_46702
Title of the Manuscript:	Understanding the Nigerian Healthcare Delivery System: A Paradox of Preventive Medicine since the Colonial Epoch
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>Understanding the Nigerian Healthcare Delivery System: A Paradox of Preventive Medicine since the Colonial Epoch</b></p> <p>I read this manuscript and I think it could be an acceptable text if certain aspects are clarified and corrected. The subject is interesting. In any case, I congratulate the authors for their effort. I suggest that, please, the authors verify the following comments:</p> <p><b>-Material and methods:</b> The authors refer to the method as: "An extensive review of literature."  The authors must clarify it. It seems that the article is a review of the literature, or a mix between that and an opinion article or Essay.  Two different types of literature review research are available: systematic review and non-systematic review or narrative review (update). The traditional method of review of the literature has been the narrative review, but it has two basic weaknesses. First, there is no rule on how to obtain primary data and how to integrate results; that is the subjective criterion of the reviewer. Second, the narrative reviewer does not synthesize quantitatively the data found in the different publications; therefore, these revisions are very susceptible to inaccuracies and biases.</p> <p><b>-Argumentation:</b> It is fundamental in opinion articles. The author should try to defend his thesis and arguments through the contribution of data (and references), reasons, and examples of different situations. Likewise, it is advisable to also show a vision opposite to the one exposed. I suggest, for a better understanding of the readers, that the author synthesize and summarize in a Table their reflections, and data. To helping the reader to think clearly, one suggestion is to write the arguments for and against in a Table.</p> <p><b>-Conclusion:</b> It is important in any scientific paper to point out the problems that, from the current essay or study, are still pending solution or clarification.</p> <p><b>-References:</b> Review, please, the rules of the Journal.  The abbreviations of journals should conform to those of the US National Library of Medicine for Medline / PubMed (available in: <a href="https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog/journals">https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog/journals</a>) For example: Journal Of Developing Areas. NLM Title Abbreviation: J Dev Areas</p> <p><b>-Keywords:</b> For keywords the list of Health Sciences Descriptors terms should be used (Medical</p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	Subject Headings, MeSH) of Index Medicus (available in <a href="https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search">https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search</a> )	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jose Luis Turabian</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Health Center Santa Maria de Benquerencia, Regional Health Service of Castilla la Mancha (SESCAM), Spain</b>