



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_44948
Title of the Manuscript:	Implementation of Mobile phone Reminder System to Improve Immunisation Uptake in Abakaliki, Southeast, Nigeria: Its feasibility and acceptability
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:

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



[SDI 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	<p>It seems strange that the discussion does not cover possible reasons why coverage was higher in the control group for two ages and much higher in the intervention group for one age. I assume that the causes were factors such as stock-outs and the amount of outreach being carried out, but without possible explanations the findings just seem curious.</p> <p>Line 73: I assume enrollment means a caregiver was asked if s/he had access to a cell phone and would be willing to be reminded. But a crucial aspect of the feasibility being explored is what % of caregivers did or did not have access to a cell phone. That information should definitely be mentioned if it is known. I would think that it's those caregivers without access to phones who need the most support. Also, the article should make clear where the participants were recruited. If in a health facility, the main benefit might be in improved timeliness of vaccination (since all participants had access to services and were at least willing to start the vaccination series). If in communities, the intervention might be more likely to benefit both timeliness and completeness of vaccination.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>I think that the article could do better in describing the general context. For example, immunization coverage in Nigeria remains far too low but is improving. While there are multiple reasons for this low coverage, the absence of accessible services that offer all antigens daily is a major one that should be mentioned. Certainly caregiver awareness of due dates is important, but reminders are not the only way to improve this awareness. Better counseling at the time of vaccination on the next due date and of its importance is essential. And, as the article argues, reminders can also help, assuming that the service is there.</p> <p>Nigeria is a country with a huge equity gap related to immunization. The families in the richest wealth quintile are several times more likely to be immunized than those in the poorest quintile. The article might mention that reminders, if coupled with accessible and reliable services of reasonable quality, could reduce this equity gap as well as improve coverage.</p> <p>Line 57: "infants are reminded..." It's the caregivers that are reminded. Line 60: I would argue that caregivers don't have to memorize the vaccination schedule: they do need to know when to get the first vaccination and then each next one. Line 74: Were the phone calls automated, i.e. with a recorded message, or were they actual calls from a health worker. In Kisumu, Kenya, both methods helped but the latter was more effective. Actual calls also imply more time from health staff, which may or may not be feasible in particular settings.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>In general the article is clearly written and organized and should contribute to the growing literature on reminders and recalls for immunization. However, I do think that a few considerations need to be added or clarified before publication.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Michael Favin
Department, University & Country	USA