

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_120761
Title of the Manuscript:	Vaccination timeliness and completeness among mothers of children between 0-1years in South-South Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I like the goals of this article because I think vaccination is a very important issue and it affects the health of babies and their future. Investigation of the importance and acceptance of this issue is very necessary, especially in societies that still do not attach special importance to vaccination. However, I believe that the implementation of the article, especially in the method, was not done correctly and should have been implemented more carefully.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, the title is not suitable; it does not reach the purpose of the article. My suggested title: "Investigating the opinion of the timeliness and completeness of the vaccination program among mothers with children aged 0-1 years in South-South Nigeria"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It is better to divide the abstract into different parts such as introduction, method, results and discussion, but it should be in accordance with the format of the journal. It should be added to the "structured" questionnaire created by the researcher. The final conclusion is obtained according to the objectives. Keywords should be standard.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The division of the sections of the article is good, but the method section, especially about the researcher-made questionnaire, should explain more about what items it has. How is it valid and reliable? The analyses are only descriptive and do not have any analysis. The results part is only a description and percentage, and for a purely descriptive and cross-sectional article, this sample size is small. In the results, the sample size and its formula and similar articles are not mentioned at all, and these factors lower the credibility of the article. The discussion also does not match the results in some places. For example, the discussion items at the end of page 9 did not match the results of the article at all.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The topic of the article is good, but the method, results and discussion are not good. Considering that the article is cross-sectional, the sample size does not seem sufficient. It is not mentioned in the method of obtaining the sample size. The researcher made a questionnaire, but it is not valid and reliable. Because the sample size is not large, most of the samples are highly educated and employed, and this itself creates bias, and the attitude and knowledge of low-income and low-educated people are not taken into account. Also, it cannot mention all the obstacles correctly. These things affect the scientific validity of the article.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes. the references are sufficient and recent	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	As I said before, the topic of the article is good, but the article is not done properly and it is not suitable for publication with these scientific problems.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mehri Kalhor
Department, University & Country	School of Nursing and Midwifery, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Iran