

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_126380
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Exploring the Impact of Vaccination Strategies on Reducing the Prevalence of Cholera- and Rotavirus-Induced Diarrhoea in Children in Bangladesh, India and Pakistan.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Systematic Review</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	I liked the manuscript. The methodology which is used for analysis is looking very scientific, systematic, coherent and largely new. Manuscript is very successful in conveying its message to scientific community due to its adoption of a scientific method like: SPIDER Framework, PRISMA tool and by using the four Theme very scientifically.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title of the article is suitable as per me as it is capturing the theme of the study	
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.	As per my view abstract is alright. But there should be some inclusion of the points about why people are not that susceptible to vaccination.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	There are some repetitions in the subsection of the content. Other wise its structure is alright	
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.	Manuscript has a scientific orientation due to the method which the article has applied. Comparison strategy of the vaccination is done by dividing it in four themes is looking very scientific. Overall, the article is looking scientifically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Reference is recent and sufficient, but it should be enriched by including some article from journal called "Nature".	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is clear and easily conveying its message.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	No data's or report of field work has been provided.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nahid Hasan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>GGV, India</b>