

Paper: “The Big Catch-up: Addressing Zero-Dose Children as a Surrogate of Vaccination Disruptions During Public Health Emergencies: A review of literature”

Submitted: 20 August 2024

Accepted: 27 November 2024

Published: 31 December 2024

Corresponding Author: Snehil Singh

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n36p19](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n36p19)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dionysios Vourtsis
University of West Attica, Greece

Reviewer 2: Elton Chavura
University of Livingstonia, Malawi

Reviewer 3: Georgios I. Farantos
University of West Attica, Greece

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: See Comments

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

No, its confusing

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

no ,nothing is presented just generalized results with no figures

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

yes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

no

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

to some extent

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

no, not supported so cannot say accurate

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

yes

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Abstract should contain some statistics showing evidences of what you are talking about, it should be clearly stated the following

Background

Aim of study

Methods: in one to two rows

Results: important results with very important figures

Conclusion: in one to two rows

Recommendations: only one or two

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title describes exactly the content of the article

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract describes the method and the conclusions. However, the abstract should follow a defined style that sets out the goals, objectives, methods, results and generalizations in separate proposals.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Very good use of grammar and spelling. A very few mistakes.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The only method has been used is not explained very clearly.

Clarify the research questions in the methodology stage

Clarify whether you used any checklists for the study

Clarify the conclusions if the hypothesis is verified
An initial large part of the methodology concerns theory that does not belong to this section and must be limited.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

It would be preferable that certain arguments be presented with bullets points and supported by explanatory figures.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusions are satisfactory and well written.

However, the problems raised by the authors should be mentioned by name at the conclusions stage.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

APA style is more appropriate for formal writing.

You must strictly follow the APA style (especially in conference proceedings)

do not leave blanks between words

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

You should follow a clearly structured style (including Purpose – Data Source - Study design – DataCollection / ExtractionMethods – Mainfindings – Conclusions – Keywords) for the abstract.

I suggest that you improve the format of the references. Follow the APA style, which is a suitable style for the ESJ. You have to improve the types of references.

I recommend that you clearly state the research questions in the methodology stage and clarify whether you used any checklists for the study and state the conclusions if the hypothesis is verified.

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and provides indication of what the paper entails.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract provides a clear description of objects, methods, and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are a few grammatical errors in the article (should add some spaces).

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

It effectively outlines the study's methodology.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes it is mostly clear, except in Table 5 (better adjustment of font and columns, for a more clear presentation).

Also APA citation style inside the paper should be used.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes it is. But some more text is required regarding the authors' suggestions on how to overcome cultural and sociopolitical factors, as well as a lack of resources, in the local contexts.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer E:
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear although there is room to trim it to a word limit of 10-12 words

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

No, the title lacks structure, format and does not focus on the findings of the study.

The abstract is off-track. The conclusion and recommendations are clearly missing.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Grammar is and spelling checks- all good

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

No methodology at all. I have shared some documents/ files and some links to help the authors to structure this section

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body is not concise, incoherent and contains structural errors, and misleading narrative

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

This section is poorly done. It is a replica of introduction. New issues have been introduced which were never discussed at all throughout the entire length of the paper.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The entire section needs an overhaul.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Come up with a proper abstract. Show the methods you have used in coming up with your findings. Briefly present key findings in the abstract. Then present your conclusion and your recommendations based on the study findings. I would like you to clearly state whether this is a systematic review, a scoping review, a literature review or a primary study as this will determine the review focus. Try to follow an academic structure to present your paper. Re-do the methodology, results section and conclusion. Your data from key informants is missing. Your paper must be informed by research practice, models and theories that help to predict facts and to identify the relationship among attributes, variables or data. I have tried to share important links to help you structure your document so that it meets minimum academic standards.
