

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_92128
Title of the Manuscript:	Adherence to COVID19 vaccine among health care providers in Merowe Hospital in rural area at North Sudan
Type of the Article	ORIGINAL

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>METHODOLOGY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give full name of department, institution where this study was conducted • Give proper study design and should be same in abstract and methodology • Give exact duration of study (DD/MM/YY) • Add inclusion/exclusion criteria precisely • Give methodology precisely , briefly with all important details and delete unnecessary steps , in order • Which data or variables collected as per objective and how = give precise details • How data was collected? • Who collected the data? • How Bias in data collection were addressed • Which statistical analysis is done and on which variables? <p>RESULTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Start with total number of subjects • Present data as per objective , delete all unnecessary data beyond objective domain • Tables not labelled properly – it should give information which data presented • Give n value in each table labell • Give data in both n and % or statistical value • Give results of each table separately in separate para in order with imp results in both % and n value or statistical values • Present data as per objective, delete unnecessary data <p>DISCUSSION: is the weakest part of manuscript whereas the discussion is the main body of a research paper in which all results discussed/ compared/ with reasoning and rationale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not written with proper reasoning , rational and in scientific way with out come directed towards conclusion drawn • Discuss each variable/parameter in separate paragraph, Start by giving info that which variable is going to be discussed, than Compare your results with literature, give reasons/justification in a scientific way if they varies Then give outcome of that discussion in last sentence of that para. • Similarly discuss all variables separately • Write within domain of objective • Omit/delete all other discussion beyond scope of objective • Construct proper sentences with continuity and should be meaning full. • Make discussion directed towards conclusion • Don't use one sentence paragraph in discussion or anywhere in manuscript 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise title: make it more meaningful, crispy, and attractive • Delete omit all known, common facts and details beyond the scope of objective • Delete /omit all repetitions • Be precise, to the point - no unnecessary details • Sentences should be coherent, containing precise details and well-constructed • Check for Grammar at places • Objective , study design and conclusion should be exactly same every-where in manuscript • Don't use one or two sentence paragraph, express one idea in one para with out come in last sentence of that para • Give conclusion based on your results- not your own ideas or recommendations 	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ishtiaq Ahmed
Department, University & Country	Isra University, Pakistan