

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
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 study deals with a specific geographical location, and makes significant contributions to the existing literature in the area. The methodology and approach are distinct and clear. It can act as a good source of information for people working on immunisation around that area.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It can be reframed as "VACCINATION COVERAGE AGAINST HUMAN PAPILLOMAVIRUS (HPV) – A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY FOR THE MUNICIPALITY OF ANANINDEUA"	
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.	Yes, the abstract is good to go.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
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 selected area is less explored hence the methodology the researcher has adopted suits the need of having a preliminary look at the existing scenario. It's empirical and doesn't involve any sort of subjectivity.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes but some more can be added.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor errors in sentence framing are observed. Needs proofreading.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Alisha Pathak
Department, University & Country	Central University of South Bihar, India