



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_22026
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors Affecting Children Immunization among Rural Famers in Ondo State, 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>)

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	• Editing. The article contains a number of linguistic mistakes (word usage, grammar). For example, it should be farmers instead of famers. Line 29 helps instead of help, and others in manuscript. • In Abstract, no keywords. Moreover, the purpose should reflect other parts of the study. • Purpose. The purpose should reflect the title and should be consistent with other parts of the study. My suggestion for the objectives or purposes is: the	Thank you for the effort, I have done the necessary corrections.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	main objectives for the study were: 1) to determine respondents' awareness about children immunization; 2) to evaluate respondents' perception about factors influencing acceptance of children Immunization; and 3) to examine the relationship between socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents and children immunization. • It should be socio-demographic characteristics and not socio-economic characteristics. • Methods 1) Design: the authors did not mention the type of the design used to conduct the study. 2) No identification for inclusion and exclusion criteria for sample. 3) No explanation for instruments used for data collection. 4) No description for ethical considerations. 5) No explanation for statistical analysis and tests used for analysis and for p value, while the researchers mentioned in abstract that they used <i>Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics</i>. • Results and discussion. 1) The authors should mention only the significant results not all the results, to avoid the repetition of the data in figures, for example, sources of awareness. 2) Some discussion need citation. • Conclusion: need more focusing on significant results. • Limitations were not mentioned. • In figure 2: the results were unclear, it is better to write the percentages for sources of awareness on the figure. • Table chi-square. It is without number. So that it	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	should be numbered as table 2: relationship between socio-demographic characteristics and children immunization. In table instead of writing the decision significant, write the p-value and results of p-value and mark the value if it is significant, furthermore write in footnote about p-value if it is <0.05 or ≤ 0.05 . • Numbers less than 10 should be written as words. What the authors mean in table 1 by remark U?????? Ethical issue: <u>No, but it is better for the researchers to mention the ethical approval for this study.</u>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• In hypothesis, no need to write Ho. Just write the hypothesis. • Justification of the study should be integrated with introduction. • References need organization and to be according to the Journal style.	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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)	