

### 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

<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.	Good idea for a study	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Abstract is very sketchy with only 87 words. Abstract should be around 200 to 250 words.	
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.	Methodology should be more robust. It should also include details of software packages etc used for data analysis,	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The study has only 9 references. It should have around 15 to 20 references. References should also include similar studies carried out earlier in the same country or in different parts of the world. Such references need to be appropriately cited in the discussion for comparison of the present study with previous studies.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language needs improvement in various sections of the manuscript. Some words are repeated in some sentences. These corrections need to be carried out.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Many sentences are repeated in various sections of the manuscript. The discussion needs improvement.	

#### 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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maninder Pal Singh Pardal
Department, University & Country	India