

Review Form2

Book Name:	Disease and Health Research - New Insights
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2209
Title of the Manuscript:	CROSS BORDER PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE MEASURES TO COMBAT THE IMPORTATION OF INFECTIOUS DISEASES IN WALVIS BAY, NAMIBIA: AN EXPLORATORY, DESCRIPTIVE QUALITATIVE STUDY
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses a critical aspect of global health—cross-border preparedness and response to infectious diseases. By focusing on Walvis Bay, a key entry point in Namibia, the study provides valuable insights into the practical challenges and strategies involved in preventing the spread of infectious diseases across borders. The emphasis on qualitative data allows for a nuanced understanding of the local context, which is often overlooked in broader studies. I appreciate the manuscript for its real-world applicability and its potential to inform more effective health policies and collaborative efforts, not only in Namibia but also in other regions facing similar challenges.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of article is suitable. But Still wish to suggest altenative title “Cross-Border Health Preparedness and Response in Walvis Bay, Namibia: A Qualitative Study on Combating Infectious Disease Importation” “Combating Infectious Disease Importation in Walvis Bay, Namibia: Cross-Border Health Preparedness and Response – A Qualitative Exploration”	
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 of the article is comprehensive, providing a clear overview of the study's background, methods, results, and conclusions. However, I have a few suggestions to enhance its clarity and impact: The "Conclusion" could be strengthened by offering more specific recommendations or implications based on the findings. For instance, mentioning how health authorities or policymakers can apply these findings to improve cross-border health measures would make the abstract more impactful. Consider merging some repetitive points in the "Results" and "Conclusion" sections to avoid redundancy and ensure a more concise summary.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness by employing a qualitative approach to explore cross-border health preparedness in a specific geographical context. The use of descriptive methods allows for an in-depth understanding of the localized challenges and responses, which is critical in forming targeted public health strategies. Additionally, the focus on a real-world setting like Walvis Bay provides practical insights that can be applied to similar contexts globally, enhancing the study's applicability. The study's design, focusing on qualitative data, is technically sound as it aligns with the exploratory nature of the research question, ensuring that the findings are grounded in the experiences and perceptions of those directly involved.	

Review Form2

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Reference are Sufficient and mostly recent. Few reference if possible can be considered if updated data is available. For example, World Health Organisation. (2005).The International Health Regulations, 3 rd edition. Outdated; recent versions of IHR should be referenced.Irecommend to supplement with the latest editions.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/Generalcomments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	G. Devipriya
Department, University & Country	Sri Krishna Adithya College of Arts & Science, India