
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 28.09.2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 12.10.2016
Manuscript Title: Adverse events following administration of DTwP containing vaccines in Albanian children from 2003 to 2015.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1045/16	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> <i>Several grammatical errors are present along the manuscript, as well as spelling mistakes.</i> <i>I suggest to submit the manuscript to a mother tongue English reviewer.</i> <i>Last, the acronym AEFI is not explained in full.</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> <i>The manuscript should be restructured by adding a separate Material and Methods section as some data in the Introduction (i.e. numbers and types of reported adverse events) can be moved to this new section. Furthermore, a Discussion section is also missing and should be inserted and separated from the Conclusion section for better clarity.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> <i>A brief mention to the anti-vaccination campaign carried out by media sustained by false data should be inserted.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i> <i>References are sufficient but not exhaustive.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	x
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper is an interesting epidemiological survey of the adverse effects caused by the combined DTP vaccine in Albanian children in the period 2003-2015. Although important for the relevant discussion on adherence to vaccination campaigns by parents warring about their possible side effects on their babies (mainly autism and encephalitis), the text should be better organized. In particular, the “Objectives” and “Methods” should be separated. Objectives are usually inserted at the end of the Introduction section, while Methods are separately described in the Material and Methods section, which is missing. Moreover, the English should be revised by a mother tongue Reviewer since lessical errors are present along the manuscript.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The submitted article is interesting for epidemiologists and health operators as well as for family doctors who are involved in vaccination campaigns. I suggest to accept the paper only after a structural and grammatical revision to better adhere to the international standards of the European Scientific Journal.

