

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80342
Title of the Manuscript:	Vaccination For Viral Diseases
Type of the Article	Review

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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>ABSTRACT- The abstract did not contain the elements – see my comments on the manuscript</p> <p>There are statements that need references. The author should use 1 referencing style- if it is superscript, it should be superscript all through</p> <p>METHODOLOGY- The manuscript did not contain any methodology- what data did the authors used (primary or secondary data??) how did the authors come across the data?? What were the key search words? What data bases were used??</p> <p>The abstract should contain a sentence on the methodology while the main manuscript should have a section on methodology that should contain details on the methodology.</p> <p>There are too many short sentences.</p> <p>Some of the sub-sections should be merged together. For example, Vaccines and their overview should read- Overview on vaccines- NB and the sub-headings what is a vaccine, how does vaccine works, types of vaccines, routes of vaccine administration should all be under the heading OVERVIEW ON VACCINES</p> <p>Figures- the labelling bearing figures should be revisited. Some look like tables.</p> <p>The logical flow of the write up should be revisited. See my comments on the manuscript. One paragraph should smoothly and logically move to the next. For example, the immediate paragraph under figure 4 should come under types of vaccines.</p> <p>Punctuations- full stops are missing after some sentences. Commas are also missing in some sentences.</p> <p>Recommendations- After the conclusion, the authors should include some very important recommendations.</p> <p>Reference- see my comments in the manuscript. Some references have no names of authors, but only website addresses. Also, the references with website addresses do not contain when the websites were assessed.</p> <p>Some references contained the surnames of the authors and the full first names of the authors instead of the initials of the first names.</p>	<p>Dear Editor, I made corrections as per your suggestions.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>