

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 article throws light on the pattern of HPV vaccination trend and tries to identify the risk factors causing hindrance in vaccine coverage and adherence. Such studies help to modify existing health policies and formulate new ones. This is an important public health problem which needs to be addressed at global level. Many countries have not yet included HPV vaccine in their government backed immunisation schedules	
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.	No	
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 manuscript covers a good topic of HPV vaccination. however there is a scope of better statistical analysis of the trends of coverage and oscillations. The analysis relies mostly on percentage coverage. Pictorial representation by line graphs, frequency diagrams will be helpful. An intra-agegroup variation analysis of the vaccinated adolescents would also help to identify the age sub groups amongst 10-19 years which should be more targeted while carrying out the vaccination drives.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>(1)Introduction:</p> <p>It will be better if the high risk serotypes of HPV and their oncogenic potential is mentioned in the introduction which will throw light on the risk the unvaccinated population faces.</p> <p>The serotypes against which the vaccine provides protection should also be specified along with other available vaccine alternatives (eg; Gardasil 9, providing protection against 9 serotypes).</p> <p>(2) Inclusion criteria and Variables to study:</p> <p>Under the sample heading, it is mentioned that adolescents aged 10-19 years who have received first 2 doses of the vaccine are included whereas in the “variables to study” the age group of studied population is mentioned as 9-14 years.</p> <p>(3) Data collection source technique has already been mentioned thrice. Another repetition at the beginning of the “results” adds unnecessary length to the article.</p> <p>(4)A table regarding the identified risk factors causing hindrance to vaccine coverage and adherence (eg: lack of awareness, scarcity of professionals etc) would better summarise the discussion and conclusion at a glance for the readers.</p> <p>(5)An intra-agegroup variation analysis of the vaccinated adolescents would also help to identify the age sub groups amongst 10-19 years which should be more targeted while carrying out the vaccination drives.</p> <p>Yes. language is good</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There are a few grammatical mistakes and repetition about study database, source and analysis which has made the article lengthy. Introduction can have more scientific focus in terms of etiopathogenesis of cancers caused by HPV, their risk factors and types of prevention. The results can be better analysed with greater use of statistical methods which will increase the validation and significance of the said study.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Nandita Dutta</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Srimanta Sankaradeva University of Health Sciences, India</p>