

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77739
Title of the Manuscript:	COVID-19 Vaccination status amongst College students and staff during offline classes
Type of the Article	Short communication

### **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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

### **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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Title: Not Ok in its present form. I suggest the capital C of College should be change to small letter c. It seems the article is original.</p> <p>Abstract: Mirror corrections. Line 4, college, I suggest it should be College. After the correction. The abstract is ok.</p> <p>Introduction: Minor corrections. Page 2, line 7 from the top; "&amp;" should be written "and". Line 11, there should be space between 18 - 23years. (Full Stop) and The ... Line 21; there should be space between COVID - 19 and vaccination.</p> <p>Methods/ Methodology: Not Ok in the present form. The hypothesis were not stated, which need to be because One way ANOVA was used with Chi - square. The Table used to check with the confidence Interval either to accept or reject was not stated categorical.</p> <p>Tables/Figures: Ok.</p> <p>Conclusion: In the conclusion remarks, it is either Null Hypothesis is accepted or rejected versus the Alternative Hypothesis.</p> <p>References: The websites cited, the date of accessed should be indicated because there may be improvements in the information given which may be contrary with what was stated.</p> <p>Decision: I suggest that all the minor corrections raised should be corrected, likewise with the observations raised in the methodology. The author(s) need(s) should work on the points raised. The article can be accepted after the corrections are done.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Adetunde Isaac</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Mines and Technology, Ghana</b>