



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_50585
Title of the Manuscript:	Challenges in Providing Immunization Services amongst Community Pharmacists in South-South, Nigeria. A cross-sectional study
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	<p>1) In the methodology section, the information about the census of population may be unnecessary</p> <p>2) Write a note on sample size estimation i.e. how you ended up to 68 subjects? What is the formula used to calculate the sample size?</p> <p>3) In Table 1, Table 2a, and Table 2b, there is no necessity of indicating total in the rows, because the sample size was indicated as n=62, already in the table legend.</p> <p>4) In the methodology section, it was said that 68 pharmacists were chosen. However, in the results section, the number of pharmacists was represented as n=62. Please mention the reasons for drop out of the subjects if any.</p> <p>5) Why the author was interested in finding association between lack of time and provision of immunization services only, among many other factors or challenges, involved in providing the immunization?</p>	<p>2) The study used the total population which requires no formula to calculate. (Line 126)</p> <p>3) Agree with reviewers' comment</p> <p>4) Attrition bias (Line 148)</p> <p>5) This association have been tested in previous studies.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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)	No Ethical issues