

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_123845
Title of the Manuscript:	Vaccination Hesitancy and Zero-Dose Children in Borno State: Exploring Perspectives and Implications for Immunization Coverage.
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	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>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is crucial as it provides a detailed analysis of vaccine hesitancy and noncompliance in Borno State's urban settings, offering insights into socio-demographic factors affecting immunization. Its focus on both zero-dose priority and non-priority LGAs enhances the understanding of regional disparities in vaccine coverage. The study's findings could significantly inform targeted public health strategies and interventions, making it a valuable contribution to the field.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title "Vaccination Hesitancy and Zero-Dose Children in Borno State: Exploring Perspectives and Implications for Immunization Coverage" is quite suitable as it clearly reflects the core topics of the study: vaccination hesitancy, zero-dose children, and their implications for immunization coverage.</p> <p>However, for greater specificity and to highlight the comparative nature of the study, a slightly revised title could be:</p> <p>"Vaccination Hesitancy and Zero-Dose Children in Borno State: Comparative Analysis of Urban Priority and Non-Priority LGAs and Their Implications for Immunization Coverage."</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is mostly comprehensive but could benefit from a few additions for clarity and completeness:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Objective Clarification:</b> Explicitly state the primary research questions or hypotheses.</li> <li><b>2. Methodological Details:</b> Mention the sample size and data collection duration to provide context.</li> <li><b>3. Results Summary:</b> Include specific examples or quantify key findings for better understanding.</li> <li><b>4. Implications:</b> Expand on the practical implications of the findings, such as recommendations for public health interventions.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate. The manuscript is well-organized, covering essential aspects of the study.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its comprehensive and methodical approach to investigating vaccination hesitancy and noncompliance. The use of quantitative analysis, including chi-square tests, provides a rigorous examination of socio-demographic and educational factors affecting immunization behaviors. The study's integration of detailed data on settlement types, household dynamics, and media ownership further enriches the analysis, offering a nuanced understanding of the barriers to vaccination. Additionally, the discussion effectively contextualizes findings within existing literature, supporting the study's conclusions with relevant evidence. This thorough approach ensures that the manuscript contributes valuable and credible insights to the field of public health.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p> <p>⋮</p>	<p>The references provided in the manuscript are generally sufficient and cover a range of relevant topics related to childhood immunization, vaccine hesitancy, and socio-demographic factors influencing health behaviors. They include recent studies and authoritative sources such as the World Health Organization.</p> <p>However, to ensure that the manuscript reflects the most current research and trends, consider adding references from the past two years to capture the latest developments in vaccine research, immunization strategies, and socio-demographic impacts on health behaviors. Adding recent systematic reviews or meta-analyses could also strengthen the manuscript's evidence base.</p> <p><b>Suggestions for additional references:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recent reviews or studies on vaccine hesitancy trends post-2022.</li> <li>2. Updated WHO guidelines or reports on childhood immunization.</li> <li>3. Recent research on the impact of socio-demographic factors on vaccine coverage and compliance.</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Overall, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is clearly written and effectively conveys complex concepts and findings. However, there are a few areas where the language could be refined for greater clarity and precision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consistency and Terminology: Ensure consistent use of terminology throughout the manuscript. For example, terms like "noncompliance" and "vaccine refusal" should be used consistently to avoid confusion.</li> <li>2. Grammar and Syntax: Review for any minor grammatical errors or awkward phrasings. For instance, phrases like "Suffice it to say" might be replaced with more formal language, such as "It is worth noting."</li> <li>3. Clarity and Flow: Some sections could benefit from improved transitions and clearer explanations. This will enhance the readability and coherence of the manuscript.</li> </ol> <p>Overall, while the manuscript is suitable for scholarly communication, a thorough proofreading and editing process could further enhance its clarity and professionalism.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The table 4 and 6 description, the sentence should start with in table 4/6. Its better to place the description of tables below the respective tables instead of above.</p> <p>Based on the provided text, the methods section of the manuscript does not explicitly address several critical ethical issues. Specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Informed Consent: The methods section lacks details on whether informed consent was obtained from participants. It is essential to include information about how participants were informed about the study's purpose and their consent to use their data.</li> <li>2. Confidentiality: There is no mention of how confidentiality and anonymity of participants were maintained. The manuscript should include statements on the handling of personal data and ensuring that individual identities are protected.</li> <li>3. Ethical Approval: The methods section does not indicate whether the study received approval from an institutional review board or ethics committee. This information is crucial for demonstrating adherence to ethical research guidelines.</li> <li>4. Cultural Sensitivity: The methods section does not address how the study respected cultural practices and beliefs, especially given the sensitive nature of vaccine hesitancy and refusal. Ensuring that the study was conducted with cultural sensitivity is important.</li> </ol> <p>Including these details in the methods section is essential for confirming that the study adheres to ethical research standards and protecting the rights and welfare of participants.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Hemapriya A S</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>India</b></p>