



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
• Still this paper need editing for example line 3 in title and in key words it should be farmers instead of Famers. Line 18, <i>occupation. The study</i>, should be <i>occupation. The study</i> Line 31, in key words no need to write and, just mention key words Children, Immunization , Rural farmers. Line 36, development. (1) opined. It should be development (1). Opined Line 66, instead of examine it is better to use evaluate Line 98 delete the word below. Line 98, from the Figure, delete and it is better to write the results showed that Line 107, about 6-10 persons.The marital, should be about 6-10 persons. The marital Line 122, 5 years.This, should be 5 years. This Line 132, the other.The, should be the other. The Line 153, appointment day,absence, should be appointment day, absence Line 201, embracedchildren should be embraced children Lines 186-187, need correction The chi square analysis showed that gender, marital status,education and primary occupationof the respondentshave. The chi square analysis showed that gender, marital status, education and primary occupation of the respondents have Line 215, The no payment for immunization should continue, It is better to be Free immunization program should be continued. • It is better to use socio-demographic instead of socio-economic because the authors mentioned age, gender, marital status, these variables considered as demographic data. In addition, economic status considered as social data. • I have a question, the authors wrote a hypothesis so that why they did not write in objectives that they would like to examine the relationship, while I wrote in my previous review that they should write objective regarding that and I wrote the objective that was 'to examine the relationship between socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents and children immunization'. • In Line 84. The authors could add, descriptive statistics (frequency, mean, standard deviation) and chi-square (used) were used. • No need to do description for Chi-square test (lines 86-94). It is better to delete. • The authors still did not do corrections regarding brief description of the instrument and ethical considerations. • Instead of writing percent, the authors could use %. • In statistics, use only one decimal for results in figures. For example (100.00%) , you can write 100.0%). • In results, I would like to remind the authors that I mentioned previously that you should write only the most important results, not all results. For example Lack of opportunities to be immunized (4.03), Fear/rumour (3.95) of side effects, ignorance about benefits of vaccination (4.15), lack of vaccines Lack of	Thanks, i have done the corrections.



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

understanding of the need for multiple doses (3.97), lack of vaccines/supplies (3.75), lost of immunization cards(3.84) are the major constraints to children immunization. In this case the authors should write ignorance about benefits of vaccination ($M=4.15$, $SD=$) and Lack of opportunities to be immunized ($M= 4.03$, $SD=$) are the major constraints to children immunization. The results should be written from the highest result to the lowest result. Therefore, lines 164-167 need rewriting. • In table 1 it is better to put beside, For example SA, N (%) and write in footnote that N: Number, %: Percentage • In table 2, I would like to remind the authors that I mentioned before "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. The authors did not do that. Just I would like to explain again, write p-value in table for example, 004 and put * above the value, then in footnote write * significant at p-value <0.05. • References should be numbered and written in appropriate way.	
--	--