

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_125900
Title of the Manuscript:	The practices of parents regarding their child immunization in the regions of Lahore, Pakistan changed to: Factors influencing parental practices regarding childhood immunization in Lahore, Pakistan
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1:** Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>This manuscript is very important because it was written after conducting a study to assess the practices conducted by parents towards vaccinating their children in Lahore, Pakistan. The researcher was able to develop the right questionnaire, use a good approach in calculating the sample size, administer the questionnaires, collect the data and conducted a deep analysis based on the outcome of the respondents. The researcher was able to bring clarity in dividing the questionnaire into different sections during the analysis and these include: sections regarding the area of demography and knowledge of parents regarding child immunization.</p> <p>I like the way and manner the researcher was able to use descriptive and inferential analysis to summarize the variables after collecting the data. For example, the researcher used variables and used them as frequencies and percentages. Chi square test, Fisher's exact test were applied to come up with the right statistical application which the study deserves. Chi Square tests were applied in situations where assumptions of chi-square analysis requirement were not met. Fisher's test was used to calculate P-values less than 0.05. At the end, the researcher was able to come up with the needed scientific results which centered around the following areas: Demographics Characteristics of study subjects, Time utilized for immunization, Knowledge of parents regarding their child immunization etc.</p> <p>In addition, the researcher was able to come with the summary of his work as an abstract using the qualities of a good abstract e.g. problem statement, methodology used, results and conclusion. At the end the researcher was able to recommend that the study revealed that a significant majority of parents demonstrated poor practices highlighting critical public health issues despite awareness campaigns across Lahore, Pakistan and that there is a need to improve the support system and educational initiatives to bridge the gap between knowledge and practice, to enhance vaccination rates and improve public health outcomes.</p>	Thank you so much for the valuable comments.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I do not think the title of this article is suitable. Therefore, I will like to suggest the following title below: "Understanding Parental Practices and Attitudes Toward Childhood Vaccination in the regions of Lahore, Pakistan"	Thank you so much for the suggestions; The title of the manuscript has been changed to; <b>Factors influencing parental practices regarding childhood immunization in Lahore, Pakistan</b>
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The Abstract is okay because it captures all the requirements of a good abstract which includes: problem statement, methodology used, results and conclusion	Thank you so much.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate but the researcher forgot to number each chapter in the manuscript e.g. 1. Introduction... 2. Methodology... and so on and so forth.	Thanks for the comment. The subsections are numbered as suggested.
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>Based on my review, this manuscript is scientifically and technically sound due to the following observations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>Clear Hypothesis and Objectives</b> The researcher began with a well-defined hypothesis and clear research objectives. This provides a focused framework for the study and guides the research design and analysis</li><li><b>Robust Research Methodology</b> The Materials and Methods used was detailed enough to some extent. The description of the study design, sampling methods, data collection techniques, and statistical analyses used is very clear.</li><li><b>Accuracy in Data Presentation</b> The results were presented clearly, with appropriate use of tables, figures, and statistical analyses that summarize the findings.</li></ol>	Thanks for the comments.

Review Form 3

	<b>4. Clarity in Language used</b> The manuscript was written in clear, concise language. The use of jargon was avoided in writing the manuscript. Proper grammar and spelling was used in writing the manuscript	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> -	Some recent references were used and the references used were sufficient to a level that makes the manuscript worth publishing. Although, the researcher may decide to add more references if he wish to broaden the manuscript further.	Thanks a lot for the valuable comments.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The manuscript was written in clear, concise language. The use of jargon was avoided in writing the manuscript. Proper grammar and spelling was used in writing the manuscript	Thanks a lot for the valuable comments.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There is a need to number each part the chapters e.g. Introduction, Methodology etc	Thanks for the comment. The subsections are numbered as suggested.

PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u>	The authors claim that there are no ethical issues in the manuscript.