



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_24051
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of Two Survey Methods based on Response Distribution of Pediatricians in India: Mail versus Telephone
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Mentioned in the Manuscript File –Review format Please see the attached file - Delete “of” in abstract - Reviewer’s comment: Methodology shows the vaccines included in the study are in,he UIP of GOI-MOHFW.Then how table 1 (lines 174-177) shows inclusion of vaccines other than in UIP. Viz: Pneumonia, Hepatitis A, Typhoid etc? - This is in another study (line 248-249). What about the findings in this study?	- We have deleted “of” in the first line of abstract. The sentence now reads, “The use of telephone and mail surveys raises the question to what extent the results of different data collection methods deviate from one another” - Vaccines included in the survey were ones currently in India’s UIP as well as one that are not in UIP but available in India and have potential to be added to the UIP. We have edited the sentence to include this clarification. The sentence now reads, “The survey instrument was designed to assess attitudes and practices associated with vaccines included in the Government of India’s Universal Immunization Program (UIP) and vaccines that are available in India but not currently in the UIP but are potential candidate for inclusion in UIP” - We did not assess how participants felt the cognitive demand was during the survey. We provided this sentence and reference as a potential explanation for what we observe in our analysis. We have clarified this in the manuscript. The sentence now reads, “Others have proposed that the cognitive demands on telephone respondents are



SDI Review Form 1.6

		higher than the cognitive demands on questionnaire respondents which may explain why in this study those on the telephone had a tendency to provide responses in the extreme categories [23].”
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		