



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_32391
Title of the Manuscript:	PERCEPTION OF TETANUS TOXOID IMMUNIZATION AMONG WOMEN IN A NIGER DELTA COMMUNITY, NIGERIA
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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The article brings interesting data about awareness of NNT and TT immunization in Nigeria. It is of major importance to review the language. For example: in the abstract - Study design- the verb “was” is missing in the phrase. There are other mistakes and repetition of words. In the Abstract: Results: The phrase is difficult to understand what the value of 78.6% means. It would be better to write as it was in the whole text. In Introduction: It would be interesting to describe how many children die or died of tetanus in the world and state the importance to study TT immunization. In line 20: The reference cited states “18 countries yet to achieve...” and not 19 as the article . The information content in lines 21 to 23 “ The incidence of tetanus...” was not found in the reference cited. The same for lines 25-30. Is it possible that the authors cited a mistaken reference? It is not usual to write “This paper investigated...” It would be interesting to emphasize the importance of this study. In Material and Methods: In 2.1: It is unusual to cite a newspaper as a reference [7]. Do the authors	Thank you for your observations and comments. The corrections stated here have been effected. This correction has been effected. The comments stated here have been noted and corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	have another official reference? In 2.3: The prevalence rate described by the authors was not found in the reference cited. Is it possible to point out where is it? In 2.6: It is difficult to understand the method to score “good” or “poor”. The authors should explain better why a rate “6-10” is considered good and a rate “5-1” is poor. In Results: In 3.1: Although it is possible to get from the next page, it would be interesting to state the total number of respondents at the beginning of the Results. In 3.2: The results described in lines 108 to 110 “All the women...were not.” refer to Table 2. This reference is missing. The data in lines 111 to 113 “In addition ...to NNT” refer to Figure 1 and not Table 2 as it is written. The graphic presented in Figure 1 contains only three conditions with no big differences. It seems that these results would be better in a table. In 3.3: In line 161, the data “94.7%” in Hart & Okoh (2015) does not correspond to awareness about immunization as stated by the authors. This result refers to awareness about tetanus (second paragraph of the “Results” item on page 8). Hart & Okoh wrote that “79.9% of the responders had heard about tetanus toxoid”. In line 170, it would be interesting to cite what could be done to change the fact that the respondents were not aware about the number of doses required, or even about the immunization against tetanus in general.	In 2.1: The reference has been changed adequately. In 2.3: The prevalence rate is from the reference cited. A prevalence of 10.1% of women of reproductive age who had received at least a dose of TT immunization during ante natal clinic. In 2.6: A simple grade rating of “good” and “poor” on a scale of 1 to 10 was used. In 3.1: The total number of respondents have been stated at the beginning. In 3.2: Thank you for your comments here, they have been effected, however for the purpose of
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	In line 174, it would improve the discussion if the authors could compare the data about differences in the level of education with other published articles. In line 176 to 177: the statement “Alex & Okoh did not rate the knowledge of TT immunization...” is not correct. In the same statement, the reference is Hart and Okoh. The reference cited did not detail the knowledge about number of doses, but they do state knowledge of tetanus toxoid target population and knowledge of tetanus toxoid complete dose (Tables 4, 5 and 6). In Conclusion: It would be interesting to cite what could be done to change the fact that the respondents were not aware about the number of doses required, or even about the immunization against tetanus in general, as suggested in Results. In References: Reference 1 should be cited as WHO. Maternal and Neonatal Tetanus (MNT) elimination. 2015. The data utilized in the article is contained in various parts, not only in “The initiative and challenges”. Reference 7: As suggested in Results, is it possible to substitute this newspaper reference? Reference 8: It was not possible to access this link, please check if it is correct.	making the data easily understandable at a glance and bringing in variety in the article, figure presentation is most preferred. Also since there is not much difference in the three conditions, a figure rather than a table makes it more obvious. In 3.3: The correction has been effected. This comment has been added. The comparison has been done. The statement has been expunged. Conclusion: This comments have been considered and added. References: This reference has been corrected. Reference: The newspaper reference has been substituted.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		