



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Immunology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJI_44952
Title of the Manuscript:	Missed Immunisation and Immunisation Drop-outs among Infants in Rural Health Facilities in Abakaliki, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<p>I recommend having the definitions of immunization coverage/missed immunizations, drop off, etc. moved from the introduction to the methods section.</p> <p>I'd also give some more background about immunization services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where are they typically offered • are they for free / is there a fee? • are they compulsory (for school entry, etc.) • what vaccines are specifically offered – what is the schedule – are vaccines co-administered or not? <p>Can you provide a bit of an explanation – or a hypothesis about why there is drop out? is this because of parental attitudes or because of barriers (time / access / money)</p>	<p>Thank you Sir/Ma for your recommendation. Please, I humbly suggest that we allow the definitions be in the introduction section for ease of understanding.</p> <p>Corrections done. Pls see lines 51 to 54</p> <p>Correction done, see line 54</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Could you provide a bit more context about your study site? What is the main demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of Abakaliki, Ebonyi?)</p> <p>Also – because one of the major findings was that Mile Four and St. Vincent had different vaccination characteristics, could you briefly explain how they differ? Are they both public clinics? DO they service different kinds of areas / populations?</p>	<p>Correction done. See lines 59 and 60</p> <p>Correction done. See line 60</p>
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	