

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_129177
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY TO ASSESS THE KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDE REGARDING OPTIONAL VACCINES AND BARRIERS TO USE AMONG MOTHERS OF UNDER FIVE CHILDREN IN KHEDA GUJARAT
Type of the 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	While certain jurisdictions make certain vaccines compulsory, the existence of optional vaccines creates an incomplete coverage scenario. This study is important in the context of the rising debate of non-vaxxers worldwide. It could help to illustrate if the barriers to the use of optional vaccines are due to some prejudiced beliefs or other socioeconomic factors.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I believe the title maybe better worded as, "ASSESSMENT OF THE KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDES REGARDING OPTIONAL VACCINES AND BARRIERS TO USE AMONG MOTHERS OF UNDER-FIVE CHILDREN IN KHEDA GUJARAT".	
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.	The methodology section of the abstract says mothers were selected by systematic random sampling while the actual text says they were selected by non-probability purposive sampling. Please clarify what method was used to select participants.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>What statistical method was used to determine the association between the variables mentioned in the methodology? Kindly state them and ensure the grammar is correct and the language is easy to read.</p> <p>The lower boundary for the ages of the mothers in the Tables 1 and 6 includes numbers like 25.1 and 30.1 while the age of the child does not include such decimals. Kindly clarify this disparity and how the ages of the mothers were obtained for this study.</p> <p>In the result section, "340 (88.55%) mother did not provided information regarding optional vaccine" – kindly clarify what is being described (is it the percentage of children who haven't received optional vaccine?) and correct any grammar issues.</p> <p>Table 2 has a blank cell, kindly indicate what proportion of the population is being categorized or referred to here</p> <p>The means of the variables presented in Table 3 need to interpreted in the explanation text below. What is the implication of the score given to the knowledge and attitude in this study?</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are insufficient. Many sentences in the introduction that cover the history of vaccination in human beings need to be appropriately referenced and all in-text citations need to be identified with a superscript number matching the bibliography or otherwise according to the journal specifications.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	In the abstract, it says "When 1 (0.3%) mother have Unfavourable attitude, 275 (71.6%) have moderate attitude, and 108 (28.1%) have favourable attitude towards optional vaccination." Did you mean to say "While"	
Optional/General comments	The discussion and conclusion section have a lot of similarly worded sentences which makes it seem repetitive. The discussion section also needs to be lengthier and needs to be discussed in the broader context of already existing research with references to draw similarities or contrasts as the case may be.	

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:	Akinbowale Akinyemi
Department, University & Country	Lagos State University College of Medicine, Nigeria