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,** *occupation.The study***, should be** *occupation. The study* **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 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.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Malakeh. Z. Malak***
Department, University & Country	***Faculty of Nursing, Al-Zaytoonah university, Jordan***