

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.	This study provides valuable insights into the socio-cultural, economic, and informational challenges that impact vaccine utilization. The findings can inform public health strategies aimed at improving vaccination coverage in rural and underserved populations, thereby contributing to broader public health goals such as reducing preventable diseases and improving child health outcomes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Knowledge, Attitudes, and Barriers to the Utilization of Optional Vaccines Among Mothers of Children Under Five Years of Age in Kheda District, 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 abstract of the article provides a general overview, but it could be improved for clarity and precision. Firstly, terms like "a straightforward" should be replaced with more academic word, such as "an effective" Additionally, it is important to mention the specific statistical analyses used in the study, such as "regression analysis" or "Student's t-test," as this would strengthen the credibility of the results. The omission of such details makes the outcome of the study less transparent. Finally, to enhance searchability and accuracy, I recommend using appropriate keywords from the MESH database (https://meshb-prev.nlm.nih.gov/).	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	This manuscript needs a detail proofreading as there are many instances where unacademic language is used, such as use of first person, contractions and run on sentences. This paper lack clarity, and methods section is scientifically not sound. Please refer to attached file for more detailed comments.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	This manuscript lacks credibility. References are outdated and in-text citation is missing. Please use proper in text citation and references from 2019 onwards.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	A detail proofreading required. There are many grammatical mistakes and text lack clarity.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Muhammad Qumer
Department, University & Country	Western Sydney University, Australia