

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_126271
Title of the Manuscript:	Perception of Childhood Routine Immunization among Adults in Selected Communities of Ido Local Government Area, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is important assess the perception and knowledge of the general public particularly parents, mothers and guardians etc to routine immunization. The mixed methodology is a good approach to studying a problem of this nature. However, how the researchers go about conducting the study can make or mar the findings.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Perception and knowledge of Childhood Routine Immunisation among parents and care givers in Selected Communities of Ido Local Government Area, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The background should state why the perception and knowledge of parents to routine immunization is important in the prevention of childhood killer diseases before stating the objectives of the study. The study design should be part of the methodology sub-section. The statements...high level of vaccine preventable diseases ...and high level of perceived benefits of immunization need to be clarified (positive or negative perception or are vaccines perceived to be beneficial or not ?) The conclusion is not based on the findings about perception and knowledge but on correlation al level between educational level and maternal education level?	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The sampling technique (how) may precede the sample size estimation (how many) do you select? Limitations of the study and ethical concerns are usually stated in the methodology section and not in the results section. The contents of the limitations were largely wrong or merely challenges in conducting the study which could have been overcome. The results can be generalised if properly conducted.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically correct and robust but it is not technically sound. There are grammatical errors and incomplete sentences especially in the introduction before references (5,7) and under exclusion criteria, data analysis as well as the use of colloquial language such as mom etc.. The objective is not clear about who the respondents were; are they children or adults and what about them the authors want to study as there were infusions and confusions about awareness, misunderstanding, illiteracy as if these are the objectives of the study (which are perception and knowledge of respondents). The systematic sampling technique, validity of the instruments and the qualitative data analysis method were not adequately explained. Under results, figures 1 and 3 are repetitions of tables 1 and 3 which are not necessary. Results in tables 2 & 3 reported attitudes of respondents using the LIKERT scale (Agree/Disagree) and not perception (what the respondents think about routine immunization). I could not find the results on knowledge. The quantitative vs. the qualitative findings do not	

Review Form 3

	appear to report on the same specific objectives in an orderly matter and this applies to the discussion section as well.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references appear sufficient and recent, however there need to state the date some of the references were accessed.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors need to work extensively on the technical problems, the language and grammar used in the manuscript.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ramsey Msheliza Yalma
Department, University & Country	University of Abuja, Nigeria