

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_118981
Title of the Manuscript:	A TEN-YEAR REVIEW OF NEONATAL TETANUS SEEN IN A TERTIARY HEALTH FACILITY IN SOKOTO NORTH-WESTERN NIGERIA: BEFORE AND DURING COVID 19 PANDEMIC
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.journalajpr.com/index.php/AJPR/editorial-policy>)

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes it is a valuable research demonstrating the importance of paying attention to sustaining high immunization coverage especially in outbreak type situations.</p> <p>Yes it is suitable. Minor edits have been included.</p> <p>Yes. I think that the conclusion can be reworded slightly to emphasize the importance of vaccination especially in a situation like the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>References seem sufficient. However, need to check some references if placed correctly as a few were not relevant to the content being referenced.</p> <p>Felt that it would be better to include the frequencies within brackets with the percentages placed ahead. E.g. 4.0%(n=1) used chlorhexidine gel. Just a suggestion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It was suitable. However, have included a few suggestions to edit the grammar accordingly.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Was there a particular reason as to why associations with NNT were not checked for factors such as maternal vaccination status, duration of admission & complications of NNT?</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Dhivya A Nathaniel
Department, University & Country	University of Colombo, Sri Lanka