

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_81107
Title of the Manuscript:	Review on Covid-19 vaccines and vaccination report
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Title of the paper is too general as it stands. However, the authors discuss the findings of vaccination in Nigeria. Thus, the title should be formulated as: Review on Covid-19 vaccines and vaccination report in Nigeria 2. The paper presents a good summary report on Covid in general, the available vaccinations developed so far, their modes of action and their advantages and disadvantages as well as their side effects. However, it has not been presented in a systematic way as it lacks the objective(s) of the study, the methodology applied to collect the data. For example, it presents the side effects of the various vaccines employed. Were these data collected by interviewing the persons vaccinated? Or a secondary data was collected? 3. What are the implications of this study? The authors should be able to articulate the significance and implication of this study. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript contains several grammatical errors. 2. Many of the citations made in the text do not appear in the reference list. 3. Years of publication, in some cases are different in the text and in the reference list. 4. The authors do not seem to have a proper knowledge of the use of 'et al.' 5. There is inconsistency in citing the same sources, in the text. 6. The authors do not seem to understand that they have to identify two or more publications from the same source in the same year. E.g., (WHO, 2021) and another (WHO, 2021) published in the same year. They should have been identified as 'a' and 'b' as indicated in the text. 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The paper needs restructuring to include the most important sections of a scientific paper. 2. Citations and the Reference listing (at the end) need to be properly done again. 	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tadesse Mehari
Department, University & Country	National Commission for Higher Education, Eritrea