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# Preamble

The Millennium Journal of Health (MJH) is scholarly journal of St. Paul’s Hospital Millennium Medical College (SPHMMC) that strives to disseminate scientific knowledge relevant to human health through its open access policy. The journal contents are available as electronic and hard copies. The electronic contents are available to all readers for free and the hard copies are available on subscription.

MJH accepts scientific reports within the broader scope of health sciences, including epidemiology, clinical medicine biomedical sciences, health promotion, prevention of diseases, health systems and policies, nursing and health research methodology. The scientific reports need to be relevant to human health.

The costs associated with the processing of accepted manuscripts are covered by SPHMMC unless otherwise the editorial policy of the journal is changed. Hence, authors publishing with MJH are not required to make any payments for submission and publication.

# Part I. Editorial Policies

# Scope of the Millennium Journal of Health (MJH)

Millennium Journal of Health (MJH) is scientific publication of St. Paul’s Hospital Millennium Medical College (SPHMMC). It is an open-access peer-reviewed journal within the scope of publishing quality original articles, review articles, brief communications, commentaries, case reports/series and systematic reviews with or without meta-analysis on clinical medicine, public health, nursing, biomedical sciences, global health, policies, practices, interventions, social determinants of health, environmental, behavioral and occupational correlates of diseases and one-health relevant articles. It is published twice per year in January and July.

# Vision of MJH

To be one of the most citable and reputable journals in Africa and beyond.

# Mission of MJH

To contribute to the advancement of health sciences knowledge by publishing high quality multi-disciplinary research findings.

# Organogram of the editorial team

**Editor-in-Chief (EIC)**

**Associate Editor of Clinical Medicine and Clinical Pharmacy**

**Associate Editor of Public Health and Behavioral Sciences**

**Associate Editor of Biomedical Sciences**

**Associate Editor of Nursing**

**Editorial Manager**

Academic editors and pool of discipline-specific experts/reviewers

Academic editors and pool of discipline-specific experts/reviewers

Academic editors and pool of discipline-specific experts/reviewers

Academic editors and pool of discipline-specific experts/reviewers

Admin Center and ICT Staff Team

Figure **1**. *The Organogram of the Millennium Journal of Health (MJH), SPHMMC, August 2021.*

# Editorial policies

The MJH policies are the guiding principles for the MJH family and authors who would like to submit manuscripts to the journal. Authors should follow the recommendations and procedures in this policy document while preparing and submitting their manuscripts. Authors should take note that the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) recommendations <http://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf> and the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) guidelines <https://publicationethics.org/> are endorsed by MJH and will be applied.

## Scientific misconduct

As outlined in the figure below (Figure 2), MJH carries out series of scrutiny to assess for originality, relevance, timeliness and adherence to the set guidelines. Among others, the assessment includes checking for scientific misconduct (including plagiarism, fabrication and falsification), request to declare a conflict of interest, sponsorship and authorship.

MJH considers scientific misconduct as a serious offense of act in the health sciences ethics and practice. MJH checks for plagiarism and recognizes all of the following as plagiarized and major reason for rejection of the manuscript:

* Copying a statement and pasting it without rephrasing and without putting the statement in the quotation and citing the source from any document accessed from the internet or hard copies.
* Using other researcher’s figures, illustrations, tables and pictures without citing the source and getting permission from the owner of the copyright is considered plagiarized.
* Presenting another person’s data as your research finding is also a serious offense.
* Deleting other researcher's names and putting your name instead is an illegal and serious offense, which is likely to prohibit you from publishing in any journal across the world.

Therefore, any type of manuscript submitted to MJH is subjected to the plagiarism-proof reader software. Major plagiarism results in automatic rejection. Major plagiarism includes the verbatim copying of material that is large portion and/or is central to the piece of work (e.g., arguments or hypothesis). Manuscripts with minor plagiarism concerns are returned to authors for correction. MJH collaborates with international scholars in circulating the name of the fictitious author if he/she is identified as committed very serious plagiarism (like presenting other researchers' data in the results section and stealing published articles). MJH will apply the COPE guidelines for plagiarism handling <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Flowcharts>.

## Review process

**MJH practices streamlined peer-review process.**

### Roles of the assistant editor

All submitted manuscripts pass through the assistant editor for checking the eligibility/scope and adherence to the journal’s guidelines. Secondly, the assistant editor makes proofreading for plagiarism. The assistant editor forwards an eligible manuscript to the Editor-in-Chief (EIC) or associate editors.

**Assistant editor initial manuscript screening checklist**

1. Appropriate for the journal (Is the content of the manuscript in line with the scope of the journal?)
2. Word count, number of Tables, Figures and Pictures.
3. Type of manuscript (Is the manuscript identified as the original article, case report, systematic review and like?)
4. Formatting (Is the manuscript prepared strictly following the MJH guidelines?)
5. Plagiarism checks.

### Roles of EIC and associate editors

1. **Assess manuscript**
2. The EIC and associate editors receive plagiarism-free manuscripts from the assistant editor.
3. The EIC and associate editors screen the manuscript’s suitability for peer review. To expedite the review and publication process. The EIC and associate editors should be strict and thorough in their preliminary review of manuscripts. Manuscripts that do not seem to meet the minimum standard of quality for external review need to be rejected outright.
4. If the manuscript is suitable for peer review, then associate editors invite reviewers within **7 days** of submission.
5. **Initial manuscript screening checklist by the associate editors**
6. The overall scientific merit in terms of presenting novel results.
7. Adherence to the MJH guidelines and scope (the second time check).
8. Adherence to research finding reporting style and standards.
9. Gross assessment for the grammatical and typographic errors.
10. Presence of statements about consent for primary study participation and sponsor’s approval for publication.
11. Statement of ethical committee approval for researches involving the human subject as a primary data source.
12. **Associate editor invites reviewers.**
13. Invites at least two reviewersfor each original full-fledged manuscript, including systematic review and meta-analysis, and at least one reviewer for case reports, commentaries and brief communications.
14. Decides based on reviewers’ responses to the invitation.
15. In the event of failing to find at least two reviewers, the associate editor may invite members in his/her sub-team to act as a peer reviewer and notifies this case to the EIC.
16. Reviewers should report their assessment within 3 weeks (21 days) from the day they declared “agreed” to review.
17. **Decides after review reports as stated in the journal’s guidelines that include:**
* **Direct acceptance** (forwards the manuscript with ‘provisional acceptance’ to the EIC).
* **Accept with minor or major revision** (sends email notifications to authors informing them to revise their manuscripts within three months for major revisions but earlier for a minor revision).
* **Reject** (sends email notifications to inform authors about the feedbacks of reviewers and the reasons for rejection).
* **Accept with some concerns** (accepts a manuscript considered scientifically sound by reviewers even if concerns are expressed about a lack of advancement on previous work).
* A manuscript is deemed scientifically unsound if it is so flawed that even major revision could not make it acceptable. Plagiarized manuscripts are also considered unscientific and liable for automatic rejection. A ‘closed reject’ decision will be made and the manuscript will not be resubmitted to MJH).
* Where there are serious (non-remediable) concerns about research ethics or publication ethics, i.e., when a researcher or author misconduct is suspected, MJH will adhere to the COPE guidelines <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Flowcharts>.
* When only one reviewer’s report is received, the associate editor utilizes the experience and expertise of the reviewer from whom the report is available, involves the academic editors or consultants and reaches a decision. If needed, the associate editor seeks the view of the EIC.
* When reviewers disagree in their assessments, a decision can be taken in consultation with the consultants or one more reviewer’s opinion can be sought before disclosing the decision to the author. If needed, the associate editor seeks the view of the EIC.

**Note:**

* The whole preliminary review of an initially submitted manuscript at the editorial office should not exceed one week before making an appropriate decision.
* The invited reviewer should declare either “accepted” or “decline” within seven days from the day he/she is invited to review. Failure to do so is an automatic withdrawal of the invitation.

Guide for reviewer’s checklist and ethical responsibility

### Reviewer’s checklist

As described in detail in the guidelines for reviewers, the reviewer’s checklist includes several items but not limited to:

1. Congruity of the title with the content of the manuscript.
2. His/her impression about the title. How attractive and powerful the title is to let the readers read the abstract?
3. Abstract’s power. How concisely are the *background, objective, methods, results* and *conclusions* articulated to let the readers read the body of the manuscript?
4. In-depth assessment of the overall scientific merit in terms of presenting novel results.
5. In-depth assessment of adherence to the MJH guidelines and scope (the third time check).
6. In-depth assessment of adherence to research finding reporting style and standards.
7. In-depth assessment of the grammatical and typographic errors.
8. In-depth assessment of consent for primary study participation.
9. In-depth assessment of content and idea flow in the introduction, appropriateness of the methods and materials, the results presenting style and beauty, coherence of the discussion and conclusion with the results, and appropriateness of the recommendations to the results presented.
10. Assess the coherence of the citation and referencing with the journal’s guidelines.

### Reviewer’s ethical responsibilities

* Treating all manuscripts from the outset as publishable until the in-depth review compels to reject.
* Evaluating and judging the manuscript by its scientific merit and not to be biased by area of study/country origin, type of study and assumed authors.
* Keeping and treating the manuscript and its content as a confidential document. This is a professional and moral obligation. It will be an offense to use the data for any other purpose before it gets published.
* Reviewers should note that this is an academic arbitration. It needs sound knowledge of the subject matter and utmost ethical responsibility.
* Considering the job as a professional responsibility and completing the review as promptly as possible.
* Expecting no compensation for the review work as the worldwide practice showed for decades that peer review is a professional contribution for no return.
* Reviewers should not request authors to cite their own (the reviewers’) or their affiliates’ published articles.

### Anonymity of the review process

MJH applies the practice of masking the identities of the authors, editors and reviewers one for the other, except for editors who have the liberty to know both the reviewers and authors of a particular manuscript by name and maybe by academic profile. The peer reviewers and authors remain anonymous from submission to publication and beyond.

## Workflow of the manuscript review process

Figure 2. The manuscript review process.

\*Decisions could vary at different points: *transferring to the next level*, *sending to reviewer*, and *sending to author for revision (major or minor) or rejection*. If the decision is *sending to authors for revision*, the revised version should be re-submitted to admin centre and the cycle continues. EIC = Editor-in-Chief; AE = Associate Editor

## Conflict of interest management

Authors are requested to declare the presence or absence of conflict of interest during submission. Authors are advised to disclose any material or financial support and need to be strict to the guidelines in the authorship listing. Authors are also highly recommended to respond genuinely to the questions posed during the online submission. Academic editors and other MJH staff who are interested to submit articles to the journal have to make sure that anonymity is secured with all possible means.

The MJH endeavors to avoid any potential personal, financial or commercial conflicts of interest. Any claim of competing or conflict of interest will be soon disclosed to authors for a possible solutions before the manuscript is rejected. Guidelines for conflict-of-interest resolution before and after publication will be posted on the journal’s website.

## Frequency of publication and number of articles

For the first year (volume I), the minimum number of issues will be two and each issue will have a minimum and a maximum of 6 and 10 articles, respectively. After the first year, the number of issues published per annum will be governed by the number of quality articles submitted, the review process and the human and financial resources available.

## Research ethics and consent for publication

MJH will not consider manuscripts for peer review unless the minimum ethical standards are met in the process of protocol approval and during data collection, especially for original articles of primary studies involving human subjects. Approval of the protocol from recognized institutional review board and appropriate informed consent, as applicable, before the data collection are the minimum requirements that need to be met for all studies. Study participants must not be identified; photographs should be masked unless written and signed permission is secured from the individual.

For all clinical trials, trial registration by the appropriate legal body and meeting the minimum standard of the national ethics guidelines is intuitive. By design, systematic reviews and meta-analyses are not subjected to the study participant’s consent.

Upon submission of manuscripts, authors must confirm that the appropriate institutional review board has reviewed the study protocol. It is an international experience to follow the Declaration of Helsinki by the World Medical Association, <https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki-ethical-principles-for-medical-research-involving-human-subjects/> which, among others, states that all medical research has to ensure respect for all human subjects and protect their health and rights.

Furthermore, studies conducted locally or elsewhere have to follow the national research ethics guidelines for getting acceptance for peer review. Studies involving human participants, human data, or human tissue must include a statement on ethical approval and consent on their submission.

## Comments on published articles

MJH entertains and publishes comments and responses to published articles. The comments should not exceed 300 words and need to be supported by credible 5-8 references. The authors are responsible to respond to comments on their articles and to clarify any issue for the larger audience. The authors’ response should not also exceed 300 words with 5-8 references. There is no need to structure both the comments and responses.

## Authorship criteria

MJH adopts the four ICMJE authorship criteria.

* *“Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND*
* *Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND*
* *Final approval of the version to be published; AND*
* *Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved”.*

Therefore, to be an author or co-author, substantial contribution starting from the protocol development to the final write-up and review of the manuscript has to be seriously taken into consideration to maintain the journal’s standard and accept public responsibility for the content of the study.

## Guides on writing acknowledgments

People or organizations that make substantial financial or technical contributions to the scientific content of the research work can be acknowledged by name with a summary of the description of their contributions.

## Copyright

Articles will be published when the corresponding author completes online an Article Publishing Agreement. Authors retain copyright even after publishing online on the MJH website.  Authors have full right to reuse their articles for educational purposes and as background information for their future research works without contacting the MJH editorial office.

## Publisher

SPHMMC is the publisher of all MJH issues. Authors are responsible for the contents of the respective articles published in MJH. The views expressed in each article are not necessarily the editorial policy of the journal nor that of the publisher.

## Post-publication reviews for editorial and erratum

All efforts will be invested to avoid any grammatical and typographical errors and missed content before the publication. However, there might be rare possibilities whereby one or more errors are encountered. Therefore, the main purpose of post-publication review is to detect and correct any significant editorial and errata.

MJH welcomes all correctable errors detected by readers or authors to make immediate corrections on the online article and announce to the larger body of the journal’s audience in the next issue published in the form of hard copy.

## Data sharing

MJH supports international and local data-sharing policies. Authors are advised to share at least the minimum dataset they have used to prepare the manuscript and to deduce the conclusions as needed. The dataset will be used to interpret, verify and extend the research in the article, as appropriate. Authors should include a data availability statement while submitting their manuscripts. Authors must respect their ethical and legal responsibilities while sharing the dataset. Authors who do not prefer to share the dataset should give their reason and discuss it with the editor during the manuscript submission.

## Appeals and complaints policy

Authors can contact the MJH if they have any appeals or complaints. Regarding the appeal against the rejection of a manuscript, authors can contact the EIC. Authors should present a good justification for their appeal. Regarding any complaint about the publication process of MJH, authors can contact the editorial office. The MJH will review any complaint and provide timely response accordingly. Regarding complaints about publication ethics or scientific misconducts, MJH applies the COPE guidelines <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Flowcharts>. Authors should refer to and follow the specific instructions of appeal and complaint handling from the MJH website.

## Retraction policy

MJH makes the utmost effort to publish only accurate results without errors. Whenever authors make honest errors (e.g., misclassification or miscalculation), MJH will consider retraction with republication (also referred to as “replacement”). Such retraction with republication will be considered only when the error is judged to be unintentional and the revised version of the paper survives further review and editorial scrutiny. However, when the errors are serious enough to invalidate a paper’s results and conclusions, it will be necessary for published articles to be retracted. MJH will follow the [COPE guidelines](https://publicationethics.org/guidance) in such cases <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/Flowcharts>. Retraction notices will be indexed and bi-directionally linked to the original article.

## Promotion

MJH uses all possible media to promote its credibility and reputability to the larger audience of readers and contributors. The journal staff will do all their level best to let it be indexed in MEDLINE/PUBMED electronic database.

## MJH family

The editorial team, peer reviewers, academic editors, all the editorial and production staff are recognized as the journal’s family. EIC, associate editors and academic editors do all their level best to bring highly credible local and international scholars to the MJH family.

# Part II. Author’s Guideline

# Manuscript preparation guideline

## Guidelines for authors

Millennium Journal of Health (MJH) is an official scientific journal of St Paul’s Hospital Millennium Medical College. MJH is a peer-reviewed and online open access scientific journal that publishes articles of different categories in the domain of health sciences and does not charge publication fee to the authors.

## Before submitting a manuscript

Before submitting articles to MJH for publication, authors are highly advised to read the overall editorial policy of the journal and the guidelines as stipulated below. Authors can also refer elsewhere to the "Uniform requirements for Manuscripts submitted to Biomedical Journals" developed by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) – <http://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf>. The specific requirements of MJH are summarized below and in the editorial policy.

Fulfilling the requirements for submission is likely to avoid unnecessary delays that might be encountered during submission. The other practical way to be familiar with MJH specific guidelines for authors is by reading one or more previously published articles.

Authors need to be familiar with their rights and responsibilities and declare that they agree with the set of rules of the journal before submitting and publishing their manuscripts.

Every author or co-author must not exercise duplicate submission, plagiarism, self-plagiarism, or other publication misconduct. All manuscript submissions to MJH will be screened against the Crosscheck database using plagiarism detector software. Authors can also screen their manuscripts before submission using available software.

Manuscripts with insufficient originality or lack of nobility in the preparation may be rejected from the outset.

## Preparing manuscript

Apart from the "Uniform requirements for Manuscripts submitted to Biomedical Journals", authors are advised to prepare their manuscript in accordance with the specific formatting and style of this journal, which is again specific to the type of manuscript category (see below).

Note that the first and foremost important determinants for due consideration of the manuscript for peer review are the originality of the work and the appeal of the writing style in each section of the manuscript.

Making each section of the manuscript concise and handy is also an important undertaking to reach the wider audience of the journal. MJH exercises mainly expository and descriptive writing style in all the sections of a manuscript with little plus persuasive type in the discussion section. As the editors and peer reviewers are not responsible to make grammatical edits or rewriting the manuscript, the corresponding author has to make sure that it is written in clear and concise English.

It is the corresponding authors’ responsibility to make sure that each co-author has read the manuscript before submission for peer review and before publishing the reviewed article. All contributors should disclose any conflict of interest before submitting the manuscript. Figures, Illustrations and/or Tables borrowed unchanged, adapted, or modified should get permission from the copyright owners, and need to be clearly noted.

## Cover letter writing guide

The cover letter should provide a statement that the manuscript has not been published and is not under consideration by another journal. It should also include the manuscript title, list of authors and their affiliations; full address of the corresponding author and word counts. It should also include a brief description of the research, why it is important, and why readers would be interested in it, contact information for all authors and any conflict of interest to be disclosed. Limit the cover letter to one page.

## Guide to prepare the title page

The title is the first impression the researcher makes with his/her manuscript to readers. Thus, the title should be concise, informative and attractive with probably some suspense to get the attention of readers. In other words, authors should give more attention to the title of the manuscript to make it very powerful to let the readers read the abstract. The content of the title may speak about research design and an outcome variable. The length of the title should not exceed 25 words with a running title of not more than 10 words.

Examples:

"A versus B in the treatment of C: A randomized controlled trial";

"Is X a risk factor for Y? A case-control study";

"What is the impact of factor X on subject Y: Meta-analysis and systematic review."

Do not start the title with redundancy-prone words: “Investigation of…”, “Assessment of…”, “Evaluation of…”, “Analysis of…”, “A research on…” and so on. They add little value to the title because research by its nature is all about those words.

Authors should also list the full names, institutional addresses and email addresses of all authors. If a collaboration group should be listed as an author, the group name can be listed as an author. The names of the individual members of the group can be included in the Acknowledgment section. However, the corresponding author should be indicated with a complete contact address.

Authors should identify the type of manuscript on the title page. E.g., *original article, meta-analysis, case report*, etc.

## Guide to prepare abstract

The abstract is the second most important impression the researcher makes beyond the title. The abstract should be a concise statement of background, objective, methods, results and conclusions each structured as separate paragraphs. Describing the context, objective, study setting and design, statistical analysis used, main findings and conclusions with the single most important recommendation. The abstract should be started on a new page.

MJH's upper word count limit for the abstract section is 300 words. Avoid or minimize to the minimum (if it is a must to use) abbreviations. Do not cite references, Tables and Figures. Avoid phrases like “…are described”, “…is discussed”, “…is explained” in the abstract section. The abstract needs to stand alone in terms of giving the highlight information presented in the text.

Reports of randomized controlled trials should follow the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (<http://www.consort-statement.org/>) extension for abstracts.

Therefore, the overall structure of the abstract for observational or experimental studies includes:

* **Background:** Should state the context and purpose of the study with the primary research question/objective.
* **Methods:** Has to emphasize the study design and statistical tests used.
* **Results:** Need to highlight the main findings pertinent to the set objective.
* **Conclusions:** Should be made based on the main finding and may infer potential implications. It is important to show the clinical relevance of basic science articles.
* **Trial registration:** **For clinical trials only,** the registration number and date of registration should be stated.

Note that the full title of the manuscript must be repeated on the Abstract page header and non-structured abstracts are accepted for manuscripts other than original articles and reviews.

**Keywords:**

Five to seven (5-7) keywords representing the main content of the article need to be listed in alphabetical order. Citing the country of study increases the visibility of the article for an international audience.

## Guide to prepare the main body of the manuscript

The main body of the manuscript needs to be structured and headed by: **background, methods, results, discussion** (study limitations, conclusion and recommendations, are included in the last three paragraphs of the discussion section).

**Original article and brief communication**: The sequence of sections for the original article and brief communication should be in the following order: Title page, Abstract, Background, Methods, Results, Discussion, Acknowledgments (if any), References, Tables in numerical sequence (if any), Figures in numerical sequence (if any), and appendices (if any).

**Systematic review and meta-analysis**: follow the same sequence with the exception in the detail of the Methods section (Search strategy, inclusion criteria and study selection, data extraction, operational definitions, data analysis).

**Case Reports**: should be presented as Title page, Abstract, Introduction, Case description, and Discussion. Case reports can be rare cases, eye-catching and clinical challenges providing a learning point for the larger audience.

**Commentaries:** may vary with the subject matter interested in.

### Background

The background section should provide a summary of the existing literature and the significance of the current study to the existing body of knowledge. Partly, it is gaining knowledge on the area of the study and partly justifying the research question, theoretical or conceptual framework of the study. In short, the background section presents the rationale of the study and clearly indicates why it is worth doing, what is known and what is unknown before.

Organizing the literature review as background information, preferably from general to specific, from international to national data, or synthesizing the information thematically is acceptable. The authors’ intelligence in extracting and synthesizing the available data to have a linked flow of ideas makes the background information more complete. Specific to experimental studies, authors need to state their hypothesis in the background section.

### Methods

The methods section should describe the study design well using standard methodological terms, the study setting, the source and sample population studied, the characteristics of study participants or description of materials, the primary and secondary outcome measures in the first few paragraphs. The type of statistical analysis and the computer package used, including a power calculation when it is appropriate, has to be well described.

The methods section should also show a clear description of all processes, interventions and comparisons. Drug names should be generic. When proprietary brands are used in research, include the brand names in parentheses. The standard scientific name writing should be maintained (start with a capital letter for genus name and small letter for species name).

All measurements (length, height, weight, and volume) have to be reported in metric units (meter, kilogram, or liter) or their decimal multiples. Temperatures should be reported in degrees of Celsius (0C) and blood pressures in millimeters of mercury. Similarly, all laboratory measurements should be reported in the International System of Units (SI). Percentages need to be rounded to one decimal place.

Cross-sectional, case-control, and cohort studies should conform to the <http://www.strobe-statement.org/> panel format. Randomized controlled trials should follow the <http://www.consort-statement.org/checklists/view/32-consort/66-title> developed by the <http://www.consort-statement.org/> group. Meta-analyses and systematic reviews should conform to the <http://www.prisma-statement.org/> statement criteria.

### Results

The results section should be presented in text and, if the study is quantitative, in Tables and Figures. Results should be presented in a logical order, starting with socio-demographic data (if any) and/or the main finding of the current study. Highlight only important data from the Tables and Figures in the text. All quantitative data described in the result section should be put in absolute numbers with percentages in brackets.

The findings of the study, if appropriate, including results of the statistical analysis must be well described in words and numbers. In the first paragraph, demographic findings may be presented.

Tables, Figures and illustrations should have complete information to standalone and be self-explanatory. Limit the number of columns and rows in a Table to 8 and 12, respectively (Table length crossing a page is not attractive for readers). One or more of the following symbols can be used to further explain the content in the Table (\*, †, ‡,). The full term of abbreviations used in the Table must be documented below the Table. Tables can be prepared as Portrait or Landscape form.

### Discussion

Discussion should start by describing the main finding of the study in words – a brief synopsis of key findings. It should be followed by discussing the implications of the current findings in the context of existing evidence – what is added to the existing body of knowledge. Only the concept of other findings as well needs to be mentioned in the discussion section. Repeating the quantitative results in the discussion is a redundancy, and one of the reasons for at glance rejection of manuscripts. Extensive citation and discussion of published literature in the discussion (extending the background to the discussion section) is also malpractice and another major reason for rejection.

The limitations of the study, conclusions and recommendations need to be described and stated here. The conclusion is a summary of the main findings. You may state a hypothesis that may give some clue for further investigation on that specific matter.

## Formatting the text

Manuscripts should be prepared and submitted in a Word document. MJH uses American English spelling as a standard for uniformity in all published articles. Use 12-font Arial, 1.5 space between lines with no indent between paragraphs. Apply automatic page numbering and line numbers in one of the manuscripts consecutively. Species names should be in italics to give emphasis. Statements copied from another work must be put in quotation marks (“ ”) and the source should be mentioned.

### Abbreviations and symbols

Generally, abbreviations are not recommendable. When they are important, they should be defined at first mention and need to be used consistently throughout the whole text. An abbreviation that occurs before the Background section, in the Tables and Figures heading are not acceptable. Symbols (like: &, @, :-, Q, ∆ and others) are not acceptable. Similarly, short forms of writings (like: i.e., n’t, b/n, Rx, and others) are not acceptable.

### Footnotes

Footnotes and endnotes are not acceptable except in table footnotes.

### Allowed manuscript length

The word count of the text, excluding the Title page, Abstract, References, Figures and Tables, is summarized in the Table below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of article** | **Abstract** | **Abstract word count** | **Maximum word count of the text** | **Maximum Figures and Tables number** | **Maximum references number**  |
| **Meta-analysis** | Structured | 300 | 3000 | 6 | 100 |
| **Systematic review/ Literature review** | Structured | 300 | 4000 | 6 | 100 |
| **Original article**  | Structured | 300 | 4000 | 6 | 50 |
| **Brief communication**  | Structured | 250 | 1500 | 3 | 20 |
| **Commentaries** | Plane | 250 | 1500 | 3 | 20 |
| **Case reports** | Plane | 150 | 1200 | 3 | 15 |

## Citation and referencing

The citation should follow the Vancouver style with superscript numbering in sequential order after the full stop.

Example: The finding in this study is consistent with the finding in X and Y studies. 1,2

All references must be numbered and must be cited in the text in ascending numerical order. Incomplete reference listing is one of the major reasons for repeated back and forth manuscript submission.

The number of References for original articles, systematic reviews and meta-analysis, brief communication and commentaries, and case reports should not exceed the recommended maximum number listed in the above Table.

Listing of a reference to a journal should be according to the guidelines of the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (‘Vancouver Style') and should include authors' name(s) and initial(s) separated by commas, the full title of the article, the correctly abbreviated name of the journal, year, volume number, issue number or supplement number (# Suppl) or special issue (# spec), and first and last page numbers. Up to six authors’ initial names with or without et al can be listed. Punctuation marks should be carefully checked.

The titles of manuscripts should be abbreviated according to the style used in PUBMED/MEDLINE (www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog/journals).

Example:

1. Berhan Y, Haileamlak A. The risks of planned vaginal breech delivery versus planned Caesarean section for term breech birth: A meta-analysis including observational studies. *BJOG* 2016; 123 (1): 49–57.
2. Devries K, Watts C, Yoshihama M, Kiss L, Schraiber LB, Deyessa N, et al. Violence against women is strongly associated with suicide attempts: evidence from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence against women. *Soc Sci Med* 2011; 73(1):79-86.
3. Ryan M, Ryan SJ. Chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy: considerations for diagnosis, management, and population health. *Am J Manag Care* 2018; 24(17 Suppl): S371-S379.

Books with chapter authors used as reference should be referenced as up to six chapters author(s) name and initial(s) with or without et al, section title, In: book title, edition/volume number, publisher/company name, year published, pages. For books with no section/chapter author, up to six authors’ initial name with et al, book title, edition/volume number, publisher/company name, year published, pages.

Example:

1. Gastaut, H. Classification of status epilepticus.In: Status epilepticus mechanisms of brain damage and treatment advances in neurology. vol 34. Raven Press, New York; 1983: 15–35.
2. Roberts KB, Tomlinson JDW. The Fabric of the Body. 2nd edition, Oxford: Clarendon; 2002: 10-28.

Web references are also acceptable provided that the full URL is given/copied and pasted, and the date when the reference was last accessed is mentioned. All other information (Authors or Organization name, title) should be complete. If available, citing the DOI makes the source accessible and more credible.

Example:

1. Berhan A, Berhan Y. Virologic Response to Tipranavir-Ritonavir or Darunavir-Ritonavir Based Regimens in Antiretroviral Therapy Experienced HIV-1 Patients: A Meta-Analysis and Meta-Regression of Randomized Controlled Clinical Trials. PLoS ONE 2013; 8(4): e60814. Accessed in Oct 2018 from: doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0060814.
2. Ethiopian Health and Nutrition Research Institute. Food composition table for use in Ethiopia Part IV. Ethiopian Health and Nutrition Research Institute (EHNRI) and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), 1998, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Accessed in March 2013 from: www.worldagroforestrycentre.org/

Personal communications should be placed NOT in the list of references, but in the text in parentheses, given name, date and place where the information was gathered or the work carried out. Unpublished data should also be referred to similarly.

## Guide for preparation of figures

Figures should be numbered in the order they are first mentioned in the text and uploaded in this order. Multi-panel figures (those with parts a, b, c, d, etc.) should be submitted as a single composite file that contains all parts of the figure. Figures should be uploaded in the correct orientation. Figure titles (max 15 words) and legends (max 300 words) should be provided in the main manuscript, not in the graphic file. Figure keys should be incorporated into the graphic, not into the legend of the figure. Each figure should be closely cropped to minimize the amount of white space surrounding the illustration. Cropping figures improves accuracy when placing the figure in combination with other elements when the accepted manuscript is prepared for publication. For more information on individual figure file formats, see our detailed instructions. Individual figure files should not exceed 10 MB. If a suitable format is chosen, this file size is adequate for extremely high-quality figures.

Please note that it is the responsibility of the author(s) to obtain permission from the copyright holder to reproduce figures (or tables) that have previously been published elsewhere or all figures to be open access, authors must have permission from the rights-holder if they wish to include images that have been published elsewhere in non-open access journals. Permission should be indicated in the figure legend, and the source included in the reference list.

**Figure file types**: MJH accept the following file formats for figures: EPS (suitable for diagrams and/or images), PDF (suitable for diagrams and/or images), Microsoft Word (suitable for diagrams and/or images, figures must be a single page), PowerPoint (suitable for diagrams and/or images, figures must be a single page), TIFF (suitable for images), JPEG (suitable for photographic images, less suitable for graphical images), PNG (suitable for images), BMP (suitable for images), CDX (ChemDraw - suitable for molecular structures)

**Figure size and resolution**

Figures may be resized during publication of the final full text and PDF versions which are detailed below.

Figures on the web: width of 600 pixels (standard), 1200 pixels (high resolution).

Figures in the final PDF version: width of 85 mm for half page width figure and width of 170 mm for full page width figure maximum height of 225 mm for figure and legend image resolution of approximately 300 dpi (dots per inch) at the final size.

Figures should be designed such that all information, including text, is legible at these dimensions. All lines should be wider than 0.25 points when constrained to standard figure widths. All fonts must be embedded.

## Guide to prepare table

Tables should be numbered and cited in the text in sequence using Arabic numerals (i.e., Table 1, Table 2, etc.). A table less than one A4 or Letter page in length can be placed in the appropriate location within the manuscript.

Tables larger than one A4 or Letter page in length can be placed at the end of the document text file. Please cite and indicate where the table should appear at the relevant location in the text file so that the table can be added in the correct place during production.

Larger data sets or tables too wide for A4 or Letter landscape page can be uploaded as additional files. Please see below for more information.

Tabular data provided as additional files can be uploaded as an Excel spreadsheet (.xls) or comma-separated values (.csv). Please use the standard file extensions.

Table titles (max 15 words) should be included above the table, and legends (max 300 words) should be included underneath the table.

Tables should not be embedded as figures or spreadsheet files but should be formatted using the ‘Table object’ function in your word processing program. Color and shading may not be used. Parts of the table can be highlighted using superscript, numbering, lettering, symbols, or bold text, the meaning of which should be explained in a table legend. Commas should not be used to indicate numerical values.

## Guide to prepare an additional file

As the length and quantity of data are not restricted to many article types, authors can provide datasets, tables, movies, or other information as additional files.

All Additional files will be published along with the accepted article. Do not include files such as patient consent forms, certificates of language editing, or revised versions of the main manuscript document with tracked changes. Such files, if requested, should be sent by email to the journal’s editorial email address, quoting the manuscript reference number. Please do not send completed patient consent forms unless requested.

Results that would otherwise be indicated as "data not shown" should be included as additional files. Since many web links and URLs rapidly become broken, MJH requires that supporting data are included as additional files, or deposited in a recognized repository. Please do not link to data on a personal/departmental website. Do not include any individual participant details. The maximum file size for additional files is 20 MB each, and files will be virus-scanned on submission. Each additional file should be cited in sequence within the main body of the text. If additional material is provided, please list the following information in a separate section of the manuscript text: File name (e.g., Additional file 1), File format including the correct file extension, for example, .pdf, .xls, .txt, .pptx (including name and a URL of an appropriate viewer if the format is unusual).

Title of data, Description of data, Additional files should be named "Additional file 1" and so on and should be referenced explicitly by file name within the body of the article, e.g. 'An additional movie file shows this in more detail [see Additional file 1].

## Authorship guide

As an international practice, authorship should be for substantial contribution in the professional work of the research, starting from generating the research idea and synthesis of the literature to engagement with in-depth analysis and write-up of the manuscript. Therefore, the understanding is that all co-authors of original research or review have participated in the actual work and take public responsibility for any section or the whole content of the published article, as per the recommendation of the ICMJE – <http://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf>.

The order of the list of authors should be with the agreement of all the authors and is the responsibility of the corresponding author to follow the agreed-upon order by the team with a description of the level of participation and qualification for authorship as described in ICMJE. After submission, the order cannot be changed without the written consent of all co-authors. As an international experience, the most senior person, unless he/she is the major contributor and listed as first, can be listed last in the list.

The co-authors' responsibility is extended to giving responses to comments on published articles.

### Corresponding author

The corresponding author may not necessarily be the first or the last. The corresponding author is the one who has taken the responsibility of submitting the manuscript and is in charge of further communications with the editorial office of the journal. His/her contact address should be clearly stated, preferably with alternate contacts. It is also the corresponding authors’ responsibility to follow the status of the manuscript and give a response to the editor’s and publication team's request before the stated deadline. In case, extension warrants, the corresponding author has to communicate with the editorial office as early as possible. The corresponding author takes the responsibility of approving the final version for publication.

Use of inclusive and restrictive language

Authors have to avoid marginalizing, offensive, misrepresentative words, convey stereotype messages or evoke existing stereotypes. Rather, it is advisable to entertain diversity, use gender-neutral terms unless specified, convey respect to all people, and be community sensitive.

As research reports should not be very persuasive, there is no need to overemphasize or exaggerate the findings of the study. Authors should also be careful in generalizing their research findings to the larger population.

## Research ethics guide

For primary studies involving humans, authors should make sure that their research protocol has been approved by a recognized institutional review board and appropriate consent is secured before data collection. The registration number and date of registration of controlled research trials should be described in the methods section. Manuscripts reporting studies involving human participants, human data or human tissue must, therefore, include a statement on ethics approval and consent (even where the need for approval is waived) before submitting. It is still important to mention “Not applicable” for studies that do not involve humans, human data or tissue. Authors are advised to refer to the guidelines of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) – <https://publicationethics.org/>.

## Submission declaration

During the initial submission of a manuscript, authors are requested to declare that the work submitted to this journal for publication has not been published before (except in the form of an abstract, a pre-print or conference proceeding), or it is not under consideration for publication anywhere else.

If the manuscript is accepted by MJH for publication, authors ensure that the findings included in the submitted manuscript will not be published elsewhere in any language, without the written consent of the MJH.

The corresponding author assures that the submitted manuscript has been read and approved by all co-authors.

It is a must that all authors disclose any financial and personal relationships with companies or individuals who may inappropriately influence the outcome of the research work for any hidden agenda.

## Acknowledgment

Acknowledgment is mainly for those individuals who technically or financially supported the research work. It should be in a separate section after the discussion section and before the reference list.

## Author’s contribution, competing interest, funding and data availability

The authors should report the contribution of all authors, any conflict of interest by all authors, source of the research fund, and data availability.

## Submitting manuscript

Manuscripts should be submitted through the ScholarOne electronic submission system. Since the electronic submission system is designed for authors’ stepwise responses, it is not possible to jump to the next step before responding to the compulsory requests on each page. All sections of the manuscript (text, Tables, Figures and any artwork) should be submitted electronically.

Manuscripts submitted as an electronic mail attachment or by regular mail without justifiable reason will not be processed for review. Anything impossible for electronic version submission through the ScholarOne system needs ahead communication to the editorial office. Authors can follow their manuscript status by logging in to the ScholarOne submission system. Still, the corresponding author can receive email messages for early reminders, or early responses about the status of the manuscript.

### Submission checklist

1. The manuscript is prepared to conform the MJH policy and guidelines.
2. The word count of the title, abstract and text is within the journal’s maximum limit.
3. The full Title of the manuscript is repeated on the Abstract page of the manuscript
4. Keywords are listed in alphabetical order.
5. The title of Tables and legends of Figures is complete/describing the content, study area and year of study.
6. Tables and Figures are placed after the reference list or provided as a separate file.
7. Figures and Table citations in the text match with the names provided.
8. Similarly, all references listed are cited in the text in ascending order.
9. 'Spell check' and 'grammar check' is done.
10. No abbreviation is used in the title and abstract. All abbreviations are initially defined and consistently used.
11. Punctuation marks in the reference listing are checked.
12. Page numbers are put at the bottom of each page starting from the Title page.
13. No identity of the authors is revealed except for the Title page.
14. The registration number and date of registration of controlled research trials are described.

### Online Submission

Once the checklist is complete, the corresponding author needs to register and log in to the online submission website. Registration is mandatory for all online submissions. The registered author will be automatically provided a username and password. Authors are advised to contact the editorial office via email for any problem encountered during registration or submission.

Submitted manuscripts that are not as per the “Guidelines for authors” of this journal will be returned to the authors for correction. It is only those manuscripts that passed the assistant editor’s check list will be forwarded to the associate editor for further preliminary evaluation before they are subjected to peer-review.

## Review process

MJH exercises a double-blind review process; thus, authors should remove all possible identifiers from the body of the manuscript by restricting all identifiers on the cover page. Authors should also do all their best to hide their identity when citing their previous research works as well. Never use first person singular or plural when you are citing your work as a reference.

MJH editorial policy is to let manuscripts be preliminarily reviewed by editors and sent to two or more peer reviewers without revealing the identity of the authors to the reviewers. If accepted for production, more members of the publication team will be reviewing and making corrective comments before the final decision for publication. The editor has a discretionary right to the final decision regarding the acceptance or rejection of manuscripts. Authors have to be assured that the final decision is made after several in-house consultations. Therefore, the decision will be final.

## Accepted manuscript for publication

All accepted manuscripts would be copy-edited for grammatical and typographical errors by professional language editors. But authors should take note that manuscripts written in good English are much preferred from the outset to qualify for peer review, and probably for acceptance. Galley proofs will be sent to the corresponding author for the final touch (if any) before accepting for publication. At this stage, the corresponding author has to be prompt in responding within the given time. For all articles ready for publication, the corresponding author is requested to complete an 'Article Publishing Agreement’, detailed in the editorial policy of the journal.

# Part III. Reviewer’s Guideline

# Reviewer’s guideline

**Dear reviewer**

Thank you for accepting our invitation to review this manuscript. Your professional advice has paramount importance for the journal to publish high-quality articles and make them reputable. To ease the communication with the editorial office and authors, and above all to improve the content, organization, and readability of the article, you are cordially advised to read the editorial policy, guidelines for authors, and the guidelines for reviewers as presented below.

## Responsibility of a peer reviewer

The peer reviewer is responsible for critically reading and evaluating a manuscript in his/her specialty/field, and then providing respectful, constructive, and honest feedback to authors about their submission. It is appropriate for the peer reviewer to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the article, ways to improve its strength and/or quality and evaluate the relevance and originality of the manuscript. All unpublished manuscripts are confidential documents.

The associate editors rely on peer reviewers’ expert assessments to ensure that the journal publishes high-quality research of significant scientific interest. Reviews of the peer reviewers also assist the authors in improving the presentation of their research. Peer reviewers can make recommendations regarding revision or additional data that must be included before the article is accepted for publication.

## Confidentiality

* Reviewers are required to treat all submitted manuscripts in strict confidentiality to maintain the integrity of the review process. Peer reviewers do not discuss the manuscript they are reviewing with anyone outside the Editorial Office without specific permission from the Editor-in-chief or associate editors.
* Peer reviewers do not copy, disseminate or share information in the manuscript for any purpose.
* If peer reviewers have reviewed the article before for a different journal, let the editor knows there is a conflict of interest.
* When peer reviewers have completed and submitted their review, they should delete or destroy all copies of downloaded or printed manuscript files, as they are the property of the submitting authors.
* Peer reviewers approve, recommend major or minor revisions, or rejection of the manuscript in the version as submitted.

## Reviewer assessment before reviewing article

**Please consider the following:**

**• Does the article you are being asked to review match your expertise?**

🞏 Yes 🞏 No

If you receive a manuscript that covers a topic that does not sufficiently match your area of expertise, decline the invitation and we appreciate it most if you recommend an alternate reviewer.

**• Do you have time to review the paper?**

🞏 Yes 🞏 No

The reviewers should finalize and submit their reviews of an article within two to three weeks. If you think you cannot complete the review within this time frame, please let the editorial office know and if possible, suggest an alternate reviewer. If you have agreed to review a paper, but will no longer be able to finish the work before the deadline, please contact the editorial office as soon as possible.

**• Are there any potential conflicts of interest?**

🞏 Yes 🞏 No

While conflicts of interest will not disqualify you from reviewing the manuscript, it is important to disclose all conflicts of interest to the editors before reviewing. If you have any questions about potential conflicts of interest, please do not hesitate to contact the editorial office.

## Declaration of competing interests

Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organization that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?
6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer ***“no”*** to all of the above questions, write **'I declare that I have no competing interests'** below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below ***(Limit 300 Characters)***.

* **Level of interest**

Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript: Please select a response

🞏 An exceptional article

🞏 An article of importance in its field

🞏 An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

🞏 An article of limited interest

* **Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript: Please select a response

🞏 Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

🞏 Needs some language corrections before being published

🞏 Acceptable

1. **Scope**: Is the article in line with the aims and scope of the journal?
2. **The review process**

When reviewing the article, please keep the following in mind:

**3.1. Content quality and originality**

* Is the article sufficiently novel and interesting to warrant publication?
* Does it add to the large body of knowledge about the area of the study?
* Is the objective or research question an important one?
* Does the article adhere to the journal's editorial policy and guidelines?
* To determine its originality and appropriateness for the journal, it might be helpful to think of the research in terms of what percentile it is in?

You might wish to do a quick online literature search to see if there are any reviews of the area. If the research has been covered previously in a similar setup, pass on references of those works to the associate editor.

**3.2. Organization and clarity**

**3.2.1. Title:** Does it clearly describe the content of the article? Is the title in line with the stated objective? If not, do you recommend any modification?

**3.2.2. Abstract:** Does it reflect the content of the article? How powerful it is to let the readers read the body of the article?

**3.2.3. Background**

Does it describe what the author hoped to achieve accurately, and clearly state the problem being investigated? Normally, the background should summarize relevant researches done before to provide context and explain what other authors' findings, if any, are being challenged or extended. It should describe the purpose, the hypothesis(es), and the general experimental design or method. It should also clearly state the identified gap to be filled by the output of the current study.

**3.2.4. Methods**

* Does the author describe the study setting well?
* Does the author describe the study population sufficiently?
* Does the author accurately explain how the data was collected?
* Is the design suitable for answering the question posed?
* Are sample sizes adequate if relevant?
* Is there sufficient information present for you to replicate the research?
* Does the article identify/describe the procedures followed?
* Are the measurements in SI and metric units?
* Are drugs and species names in generic and scientific names, respectively?
* Are these ordered in a meaningful way?
* If the methods are new, are they explained in detail?
* Are the statistical analyses appropriate, correct?
* Was the sampling appropriate?
* Have the equipment and materials been adequately described?
* Does the article make it clear what type of data was recorded? Has the author been precise in describing measurements?
* Is the ethical issue well addressed?
* Are the necessary formats followed, particularly for meta-analysis and clinical trials?

**3.2.5. Results and data**

This is where the author/s should explain in words what he/she discovered in the research. It should be laid out and in a logical sequence.

* Are they clearly summarized?
* Are data in the text and tables/figures consistent?
* Are tables/figures/illustrations/pictures included necessary?
* Is information needlessly repeated? You will need to consider if the appropriate analysis has been conducted.
* Are the statistics correct? If you are not comfortable with statistics, please advise the associate editor when you submit your report. Interpretation of results should not be included in this section.

**3.2.6. Discussion**

* Does the discussion start by describing the main finding of the study only in words?
* Are the claims in this section supported by the results, do they seem reasonable?
* Do the authors interpret the result precisely?
* Have the authors indicated how the results relate to expectations and earlier research?
* Do the authors give enough justifications for finding differences if there are any?
* Does the article support or contradict previous theories? If yes, does the justifications are scientifically plausible?
* Does the conclusion explain how the research has moved the body of scientific knowledge forward?
* Are the recommendations supported by the current study findings?

**3.2.7. Tables, Figures, and Illustrations**

* Are they appropriately labeled and per the journal’s policy and guidelines?
* Do they properly show the data?
* Are they easy to interpret and understand?
* Is each legend self-explanatory?

**3.2.8. Citations**

* Are the citations according to the Vancouver style with superscript sequential numbering after a full stop?
* Are the cited references pertinent and current?
* Do they support any assertions of fact, not addressed by the data presented in this paper?
1. **References**
* Are the references listed according to the journal’s guidelines?
1. Do not make a specific statement regarding acceptance or rejection in your comments to the authors. Comments should be courteous, constructive and should relate to the manuscript and not to the authors. Structure your comments by numbering them. It makes the editor’s life a lot easier.

You can also divide them into major and minor issues to help authors prioritize corrections. Keep comments to authors separate from the confidential ones to editors. But, make sure your comments to authors correspond to your assessment on the confidential review and review checklists/score sheets.

## Reviewer confidential comments to editor

It is used to provide advice regarding acceptance, major revision, revisions minor, or rejection.

**Information Sheet to Editor**

1. **Is the article within the scope of the journal?**

 Yes No

1. **Will the article add enough to existing knowledge?**

 Yes No

1. **Does the title describe the contents of the article well?**

 Yes No

1. **Organization and the extent to which the abstract reflects the aspects of the study (background, methods, results, conclusion, and keywords)**
2. Clear and very well
3. Medium
4. Poor
5. **Clarity of the description of the literature review, study rationale, and objective in the background**
6. Clear and very well
7. Medium
8. Poor
9. **Appropriateness of the study design**
10. Clear and very well
11. Medium
12. Poor
13. **Are sample size and/or power adequate?**

 Yes No

1. **Is the sampling technique appropriate and the finding generalizable?**

Yes No

1. **Description of the methods and instruments of data collection**
2. Clear and very well
3. Medium
4. Poor
5. **Appropriateness of the methods of data analysis**
6. Clear and very well
7. Medium
8. Poor
9. **The logical presentation and appropriate displays and explanations of the findings**
10. Clear and very well
11. Medium
12. Poor
13. **Articulation of key findings and their implication**
14. Clear and very well
15. Medium
16. Poor
17. **Justification of the conclusion by the results**
18. Clear and very well
19. Medium
20. Poor
21. **Relevance and appropriateness of the references**
22. Clear and very well
23. Medium
24. Poor
25. **Appropriate presentation of tables and figures**
26. Clear and very well
27. Medium
28. Poor
29. **Recommendation**
30. Accept
31. Minor revision
32. Major revision
33. Reject

**Recognition for peer reviewer**

Peer reviewers are normally not paid for their work. They are, instead, rewarded non-financially by means of acknowledgment in our journal, positions on editorial boards, free journal access, discounts on author fees (if any), etc. Serving as a peer reviewer looks good on your CV as it shows that your expertise is recognized by other scientists. You will get to read some of the latest science in your field well before it is in the public domain. The critical thinking skills needed during peer review will help you in your own research and writing.

Different options can also be considered including ORCID Reviewer Recognition, Publons Reviewer Recognition, etc. can be considered

## Checklist for Reviewers

Peer review comments for the author

| Sr. No | Items | Response | Comments/suggestions |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | In general, how do you rate the degree to which the paper is easy to follow and its logical flow? | 1. Fair
2. Good
3. Excellent
 |  |
|  | Do the title and abstract cover the main aspects of the work? | 1. Yes
2. No
 |  |
|  | If relevant are the results novels? Does the study provide an advance in the field? | 1. Yes
2. No
3. NA
 |  |
|  | Did the study gain ethical approval appropriate to the country in which the research was performed if human or animal subjects, human cell lines or human tissues were involved and is it stated in the manuscript? | 1. Yes
2. No
 |  |
|  | Does the paper raise any ethical concerns? | 1. Yes
2. No
 |  |
|  | If relevant, are the methods clear and replicable? | 1. Yes
2. No
 |  |
|  | If relevant, do all the results presented match the methods described? | 1. Yes
2. No
 |  |
|  | If relevant, is the statistical analysis appropriate to the research question and study design? | 1. Yes
2. No
 |  |
|  | If relevant, is the selection of the controls appropriate for the study design? Have attempts been made to address potential bias through analytic methods, e.g., sensitivity analysis | 1. Yes
2. No
3. NA
 |  |
|  | How do you rate how clearly and appropriately the data are presented | 1. Yes
2. No
 |  |
|  | If relevant, did the authors, make the underlying data available to the readers? | 1. Yes
2. No
3. NA
 |  |
|  | Do the conclusions correlate to the results found? | 1. Yes
2. No
 |  |
|  | Are the figures and tables clear and legible? | 1. Yes
2. No
 |  |
|  | Are images clear and free from unnecessary modification? | 1. Yes
2. No
 |  |
|  | I have serious concerns about the validity of this manuscript | 1. Yes
2. No
 |  |
|  | Does the paper use appropriate references in the correct style to promote understanding of the content? | 1. Yes
2. No
 |  |
|  | If relevant, do any of the authors competing interests raise concerns about the validity of the study i.e., have the authors' competing interests created a bias in the reporting of the results and conclusions? | 1. Yes
2. No
3. NA
 |  |
|  | Do you think the manuscript requires English editing to correct the grammar or flow? | 1. Yes
2. No
 |  |

## Reviewer Comments/Suggestions to Author(s)

**General comments**

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Specific comment**

**Title**

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Abstract**

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Background**

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Methods**

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Results**

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Discussion**

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Citation and referencing**

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Tables, Figures, and Illustrations**

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Format for Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor

It is used to provide advice regarding acceptance, major revision, revisions minor, or rejection.

**Information Sheet to Editor**

| Sr. No | Items | Response |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Is the article within the scope of the journal? | 1. Yes
2. No
 |
|  | Will the article add enough to existing knowledge? | 1. Yes
2. No
 |
|  | Does the title well describe the contents of the article? | 1. Yes
2. No
 |
|  | Organization and the extent to which the abstract reflects the aspects of the study (background, methods, results, conclusion, and keywords) | 1. Clear and very well
2. Medium
3. Poor
 |
|  | Clarity of the description of the literature review, study rationale, and objective in the background | 1. Clear and very well
2. Medium
3. Poor
 |
|  | Appropriateness of the study design | 1. Clear and very well
2. Medium
3. Poor
 |
|  | Are sample size and/or power adequate? | 1. Yes
2. No
 |
|  | Is the sampling technique appropriate and the finding generalizable?  | 1. Yes
2. No
 |
|  | Description of the methods and instruments of data collection | 1. Clear and very well
2. Medium
3. Poor
 |
|  | Appropriateness of the methods of data analysis | 1. Clear and very well
2. Medium
3. Poor
 |
|  | The logical presentation and appropriate displays and explanations of the findings | 1. Clear and very well
2. Medium
3. Poor
 |
|  | Articulation of key findings and their implication | 1. Clear and very well
2. Medium
3. Poor
 |
|  | Justification of the conclusion by the results | 1. Clear and very well
2. Medium
3. Poor
 |
|  | Relevance and appropriateness of the references | 1. Clear and very well
2. Medium
3. Poor
 |
|  | Appropriate presentation of tables and figures | 1. Clear and very well
2. Medium
3. Poor
 |
|  | Recommendation | 1. Accept
2. Major revision
3. Minor revision
4. Reject
 |

# Part IV. Standard Operating Procedures

# Standard operating procedure of MJH main activities

## Editor-in-Chief assignment

**Assignment:** By the academic and research vice provost of SPHMMC.

**Post:** Part-time job.

**Benefits**: Recognition, director equivalent position.

**Major responsibility**: Ensure the quality and integrity of the contents of the selected articles to maintain the reputability of the journal.

## Associate editors assignment

**Assignment:** By the academic and research vice provost of SPHMMC.

**Post:** Part-time job

**Benefits**: Recognition, department head equivalent work position

**Major responsibility**: Assist the EIC in ensuring the publication of high-quality articles.

## Academic editors

**Assignment:** By the Editor-in-chief of MJH.

**Post:** Part-time job

**Benefits**: Recognition, at least 1 credit hour equivalent work position

**Major responsibility**: Ensuring that articles are published in the MJH based on their scientific merit.

## Managing Editor

**Assignment:** By the Editor-in-chief of MJH.

**Post:** part-time job

**Benefits**: Recognition, Part-time financial incentive in accordance with the regulation of SPHMMC.

**Major responsibility**: Lead the editorial office and handle the manuscript management system and manuscript flow.

## Production Manager

**Benefits**: A full-time salaried individual as per the regulation of the SPHMMC.

## Assistant Editor

**Benefits**: A full-time salaried individual as per the regulation of the SPHMMC.

## Web Manager:

**Post:** A part-time individual from the ICT directorate of SPHMMC.

**Benefits**: Part-time financial incentive in accordance with the regulation of SPHMMC.

## Operating procedure for a submitted manuscript

1. Making the online submission system always active unless maintenance is warranted for a short while.
2. Author(s) start(s) submitting their manuscript through the online system of the journal after registering online.
3. In due course of submission, the submitting author/the corresponding author is requested to the minimum to declare that the manuscript is written in accordance with the MJH editorial policy and guidelines; not submitted to another journal and not under consideration for publication elsewhere; the work is original, and not plagiarized.
4. The online submission platform sends an automatic email to the submitting author(s) confirming that the submitted manuscript is under consideration for possible publication by the MJH.
5. The assistant editor acknowledges the author for submitting the manuscript if not automatically done through the online submission system.
6. The assistant editor checks for eligibility/scope and adherence to the journal’s guidelines.
7. The assistant editor scans the submitted manuscript for plagiarism.
8. The assistant editor gives a tracking number for the eligible manuscript, which will be communicated to the submitting author.
9. The assistant editor may return the manuscript to the submitting author in case a correction is warranted. Manuscripts labeled as qualified for peer review are forwarded to the Editor-in-Chief (EIC) or one of the associate editors.
10. The associate editor further carries out a preliminary review (pre-screen) and makes a decision to either forward for peer review, return to authors for correction or reject.
11. The EIC writes a rejection letter for manuscripts that do not qualify for peer review.
12. Associate editor invites reviewers for a manuscript identified as eligible for peer review.
13. Reviewers receive a reminder one week earlier of the deadline from the day they expressed their agreement to review the manuscript.
14. Assistant editor closely follows the status of the submitted manuscript and swiftly responds to query coming from the editorial office, consultants and authors.
15. Assistant editor sends a reminder message to peer reviewers if one or more of the reviewers are not responding as agreed or not; a reminder will be sent as well when the reviewers are not meeting the set deadline.
16. It is also the assistant editor who will inform the associate editor or EIC the status of the manuscript (reviewer agreed to review or not).
17. Manuscript assessed by both/all peer reviewers as “satisfactory with minor or major revision” will be returned to the author(s) for making the necessary revision. Manuscript assessed as “accept as it is” will be processed for article production unless the author(s) refrain from publishing the manuscript.
18. In case of disagreement between reviewers, the associate editor requests third person opinion.
19. After re-submission of the revised manuscript, the same process will be followed; peer reviewers are requested to give their comments on areas of correction and any more revision may be necessary.
20. If all corrections are made in the interest of the associate editor in charge of the manuscript and peer reviewers, the associate editor issues an acceptance or rejection letter. The acceptance letter is not the final; it will be stated as “accepted for editorial work”.
21. Once the editorial work is complete and galley proof is checked, the manuscript will be labeled as “Article” and the EIC will write an acceptance letter for publication.

## Editing and production procedure for accepted manuscript

1. The production team makes a line-by-line reading for grammar and typographic check, with a special focus that may result in a major error to the scientific content of an output.
2. The galley proof in PDF will be communicated to the author(s) for a final touch.
3. The production team transfers the text in word, tables, figures, illustrations, and references into the publisher layout.
4. The camera-ready or PDF doc is forwarded to the EIC for a final check.
5. The EIC selects the articles for an issue (preferably in the order of submission unless a thematic issue is identified).
6. Selected articles for an issue are submitted to the publisher (SPHMMC) for financing the publication cost.

## Post-publication reviews for editorial and erratum

1. All the editorial members read the published articles to find any correctable errors.
2. The editorial and production office welcomes report from readers and authors of any editorial or erratum.
3. The EIC or associate editors will be informed soon for possible correction of published output.
4. The EIC approves the proposed correction the sooner possible.
5. The corrections are immediately made online and published in the form of hard copy in the next issue stating as Editorial or Erratum.
6. The production manager makes sure that appropriate correction is timely made.

## Abbreviations and definitions

**DOI** = Digital Object Identifier

**EIC =** Editor – in – chief.

**Editorial:** grammar, formatting, typographic, numbering errors, which do not have an impact on the scientific content of the article.

**MJH** = Millennium Journal of Health

**Erratum:** Errors that have an impact on the scientific content of an article, particularly having impacts on the conclusions and recommendations.

**PDF** = Portable document format

# Part V. Published Article Font and Writing Style Guide

# Published article font and writing style guide

**Each Article should have a header and footer, and all the text should be written in black.**

**Header:**

**The header line must be light blue.**

The header must include the **journal name** and **publisher,** should be written with an Arial font size of 20.

The **heade**r also should include the first author *et al* in one corner of the page and the journal publisher in the other corner of the same page written with an Arial font size of 8.

Inside the **header line,** the type of article should be written; like **Original Article**, **Systematic Review, Case Report,** etc written all with a capital letter, Arial and font size 8.

**The first page of the article include**:

**Title pages** like Title, list of authors and authors’ affiliation,

* **Abstract** like: the word abstract itself, the content of abstract, keywords,
* **Corresponding** authors and affiliation.

**The Footer** of the first page should include;

* **Important dates** like: received, accepted and published dates,
* **Journal information** like Journal name, Year of publication, the volume of the journal and page numbers of the specific article.
* **On each page, the footer** should contain the journal name and year of publication on one side of the page and DOI and page number of the article on the other side. Writing of those contents on each side will be changed consecutively pages while maintaining the contents.

The **title** of the article should be written with Arial font size of 18 and 1.15 spacing, and Except for the first letter and country names, all should be written with small letters.

 The list of **authors' names** should be Arial, bolded and 9 sizes with 1.15 spacing.

The **Affiliations** and **corresponding** email should be written with Arial font and size 8 and spacing 1.0.

**Abstract**

The word **Abstrac**t itself should be written with Arial font and 14.5 Size.

Abstract section and should be structured as **Background, Objective, Methods, Results, Conclusion and Keywords.**

These sections of the abstract should be written with an Arial font size of 11.5 and they should be bolded.

**The text** of the abstract should be written with Arial and font size of 9.5 and 1.5 spacing.

**Received, Accepted and published** date and Copyright should be written with Arial font size 8 and bolded.

**Journal footer:** journal name, the volume of journal and DOI should be written also with Arial and font size 8.

**Main body**

The main body Titles (**Introduction/Background, Method and Materials, Result, and Discussions, Conclusion, Supporting information, Acknowledgments, Author Contributions**, and **References** should be written with Arial font size of 12 and bolded.

The sub-title of the main body like **Study area, Study design, Study population, sampling technique and sample size determination, Research ethics** in the Methodology section and/or **Socio-demographic characteristics of the study participants, or any result sub-section** of the result section should be written with Times New Roman font size 12.

**The main body of the text** of the article should be written with PMingLiU font size 10, spacing before the paragraph.

**Figure legend** should be written with Arial with a font size of 8 and without the spacing line.

**Table title** should be written with Times New Roman with the size of 8 and without the spacing line.

**A list of references** should be written with an Arial font size of 8 and spacing before a paragraph.

**This table may be used as a checklist after the manuscript is accepted for publication in MJH.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sections** | **Bold** | **Font** | **Size** | **Spacing** |
| Journal name | No | Arial | 20 | Has no Spacing |
| Publisher | No | Arial | 20 | Has no Spacing |
| Title | No | Arial | 18 | 1.15 |
| Journal name of the header | No | Arial | 8 | Has no Spacing |
| Authors Name list | Yes | Arial | 9 | 1.15 |
| First Author, et al in the header | No | Arial | 8 | Has no Spacing |
| Affiliation | No | Arial | 8 | 1.0 |
| Correspondence | No | Arial | 8 | Has no Spacing |
| DOI of Header | No | Arial | 8 | Has no Spacing |
| Abstract | No | Arial | 14.5 | Has no Spacing |
| Background | Yes | Arial | 11.5 | Has no Spacing |
| Objectives | Yes | Arial | 11.5 | Has no Spacing |
| Method and Materials, | Yes | Arial | 11.5 | Has no Spacing |
| Result | Yes | Arial | 11.5 | Has no Spacing |
| Conclusion | Yes | Arial | 11.5 | Has no Spacing |
| Keywords | Yes | Arial | 11.5 | Has no Spacing |
| Text of the abstract | No | Arial | 9.5 | 1.5 |
| Received/Accepted/Published Dates | Yes | Arial | 8 | 1.5 |
| Footer (journal name, volume of journal and DOI) | No | Arial | 8 | 1 |
| Main Body Text | No | PMingLiU | 10 | Spacing before paragraph |
| Table Titles | Yes | Arial | 8 | Has no Spacing |
| Table texts | No | Arial | 8 |  |
| Tables abbreviation/end of the table | No | Arial | 7.5 | Has no spacing |
| Figure Legend/Title | Yes | Arial | 8 | Has no spacing |
| Sub-Title of the main body | Yes | Times New Roman | 12 | Has no Spacing |
| Introduction | Yes | Arial | 12 | Has no Spacing |
| Method and Materials | Yes | Arial | 12 | Has no Spacing |
| Results | Yes | Arial | 12 | Has no Spacing |
| Discussion | Yes | Arial | 12 | Has no Spacing |
| Conclusion | Yes | Arial | 12 | Has no Spacing |
| Supporting Information | Yes | Arial | 12 | Has no Spacing |
| Acknowledgments | Yes | Arial | 12 | Has no Spacing |
| Author Contributions | Yes | Arial | 12 | Has no Spacing |
| References | Yes | Arial | 12 | Has no Spacing |
| Reference lists | No | Arial | 8 | Spacing before paragraph |
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