

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_105614
Title of the Manuscript:	Readiness and Willingness of Community Pharmacists in Anambra State to Provide Immunization Services.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

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

(<https://www.journalajmcp.com/index.php/AJMPCP/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Generally, the author needs to add more referencing and updated studies. The writing of the manuscript needs to be proofread by a professional. The methodology needs more details on the source of the survey, recruitment method, and the distribution of the survey. The results are misleading and there were not enough explanation of the numbers and percentages mentioned. 2. Yes 3. Reporting the results should be written better. 4. Yes. 5. Good enough. 6. Not sufficient references, some parts were left without references. <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. No reference for "The risk of epidemic - and public health practices" b. Amend reference 3 to follow the guideline specified by the journal. c. Reference "Nigeria is committed to the goals of the Global Vaccine Action Plan (GVAP)." d. Reference the national survey mention in 3rd paragraph. e. Reference 5 and 8 are repetitive. f. Reference 11 is not related to the referenced sentence. <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Methods:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The studies from which the questionnaire was adapted from are not referenced correctly, should be amended. <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reference 15, 16 and 17 are not used properly in text. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Quality 7/10. No, the author should amend the grammar, wording, and punctuation of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction: Line 1: author mentioned "certain infection" without giving examples. Line 2: "these diseases" was referenced again without writing which diseases. Line 5 "these diseases". Overall: some sentences are not connected and not referenced.</p> <p>Methods: Study area: Line 2 "The capital and seat - urbanized states in Nigeria" is not related to the study objective therefore should be removed. Study area paragraphs 2 and 3 are not related to the scope of the study, therefore, should be removed. Readiness and willingness scales or referenced assessments were not explained thoroughly. What is the method of choosing the 10 community pharmacists for the pilot testing (random, pre-specified...).</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Results: Line 1: Amend the sentence “The response rate for the work was great” In all the variables of table 1, the % of respondents do not add up to 100%. Amend the % of the demographics accordingly. What is the purpose for measuring the mean (SD) for the questionnaire. Table 5 is not understood.</p> <p>Discussion: Remove subtitles summary of key findings and comparison of results and make it as one section. Summary of key findings: Line 5: Amend “Aside from the easiness of easiness accessibility”. Comparison of results: line 1: add “study” to line one, and add the reference 14. Comparison of results: line 10: amend reference number to match the mentioned study (5 instead of 15). Amend the references 15,16 and 17 to match the data in text.</p> <p>Add sections: Acknowledgments (if applicable). Competing Interests Authors’ Contributions</p>	
--	--	--

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:	Zeana Alkudsi
Department, University & Country	College of Pharmacy, Qatar University, Qatar