

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_125604
Title of the Manuscript:	VACCINATION COVERAGE AGAINST HUMAN PAPILLOMAVIRUS (HPV) – A STUDY ON VACCINATION IN THE MUNICIPALITY OF ANANINDEUA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### 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.	This manuscript is scientifically and technically poor with a lot of sections written the same content redundantly. The manuscript needs a lot of improvements and the support of qualified professional editing before it can be accepted.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Okay	
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.	Needs improvement	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Needs improvement.	
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.	In this manuscript lot of sections written the same content redundantly	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Needs corrections	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Needs professional edition	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The objectives of the study to be mentioned in the last paragraph of your introduction.</li> <li>2. Need to mention prospective or retrospective study</li> <li>3. Most of the contents in each section are paraphrased and redundant. Needs professional editing.</li> <li>4. Explain how the sample size was calculated and what sample size you achieved?</li> <li>5. Table 2 calculations has errors. Needs corrections</li> <li>6. Conclusion needs to be summarized briefly in one paragraph.</li> <li>7. Check all references and correct according to the journal referencing guidelines.</li> </ol>	

#### 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:	Abdul Nazer Ali
Department, University & Country	Geethanjali College of Pharmacy, India