

JournalName:	<a href="#">JournalofMedicineandHealthResearch</a>
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_JOMHR_12751
TitleoftheManuscript:	THEIMPACTOFCOMMUNITYHEALTHWORKERS ONPRIMARYHEALTHCAREDELIVERYANDHEALTH OUTCOMES IN RURAL NIGERIA: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW
TypeoftheArticle	

**PART 1: Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript explores the role of community health workers (CHWs) in primary healthcare delivery and their impact on health outcomes in rural Nigeria. The study is significant as it addresses a critical gap in healthcare systems in resource-constrained settings. By synthesizing existing evidence, the study can provide valuable insights for policymakers, healthcare professionals, and researchers. The findings have the potential to guide effective deployment and integration of CHWs in healthcare strategies to improve rural health outcomes.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The current title mentions "systematic review," but the abstract and the main text do not align with the requirements of a systematic review methodology. The title could be revised to better reflect the content if systematic review protocols (e.g., PRISMA guidelines) are not followed. A suggested title: "The Role of Community Health Workers in Enhancing Rural Primary Healthcare and Health Outcomes in Nigeria: A Review of Evidence."	

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract needs substantial improvement. It lacks critical details about the number of studies reviewed, the criteria for their selection, and the systematic review methodology (e.g., PRISMA guidelines). Suggestions for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly state how many studies were included and the range of years covered.</li> <li>• Mention the methodology used for the systematic review.</li> <li>• Highlight the primary objective, main findings, and conclusions concisely.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript needs better organization and clarity to align with the structure of a systematic review. Recommendations: Clearly define the main objective in the abstract and introduction. Provide detailed methods, including the databases searched, search terms used, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and methods of analysis. Ensure proper arrangement of sections: Abstract, Introduction, Objectives, Methods, Results and Discussion, Conclusion, and Funding Sources. Avoid redundancy in numbering and list reviews systematically.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>The references should be checked for recency and relevance. Ensure that key studies on CHWs and systematic reviews are included. If possible, add references from the last 5 years to provide updated evidence. Examples of missing or relevant references can be shared if needed.</p>	
<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language is understandable but needs refinement for academic rigor and precision. Minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasing should be addressed.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General comments</b></p>	<p>After the conclusion, mention funding sources and declare any conflicts of interest. Follow proper numbering and ensure that the review is systematically presented. Avoid repetition and maintain logical flow. Add a brief section on the limitations of the review and future research directions. By addressing these comments, the manuscript can achieve better clarity, coherence, and impact.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Vinothini C</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Madurai Kamaraj University, India</b>