



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 manuscript lacks adequate references to qualify as an original research work. There are numerous related studies readily available on literature search (even very specific and linked to the topic like 'assessment of knowledge about tetanus immunization in the community'); sadly, the authors have only listed 8 references which I feel is grossly inadequate and that reflects in the discussion part as well. So, it would be prudent for the authors to incorporate at least 20 valid references and revamp the discussion accordingly. Need to present a more comprehensive analysis on the reasons for low level of knowledge about TT immunization among women. A separate section on author's suggestions to improve knowledge about tetanus immunization in the community would be a desirable revision.	Thank you for your comment and observations. I have added more references to the work. There are a total of 23 references now and the discussion has been modified to contain suggestions to improve the knowledge about tetanus immunization.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article has been conceived and formatted reasonably well but for the revisions suggested.	Thank you for this comment.