

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77382
Title of the Manuscript:	COMMUNITY INSIGHTS REGARDING COVID-19 VACCINE UPTAKE INTENTION VERSUS HESITANCY
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The authors concluded that this study helped uncover misconceptions about the COVID-19 vaccine, which seemed less than objective. This study only shows why common people do not receive the COVID-19 vaccine. However, this study was not conducted in clinical trials, and it is impossible to demonstrate that vaccination against COVID-19 is effective entirely. On top of that, side effects of the COVID-19 vaccine are still emerging, and there have been some deaths and cases of significant side effects in many countries and regions. The authors' direct statement that the common people surveyed were reluctant to vaccinate for misperception may seem too arbitrary. Therefore, I suggest using more neutral and objective terms to express the intention of writing this study.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>#1. In 5. DISCUSSION, the authors use the term <i>Encouragingly</i> to describe the prevalence of belief towards the COVID 19 vaccine providing complete protection was 31.28%, which does not seem appropriate because this percentage is less than one-third, implying that the vast majority of people do not believe that the COVID-19 vaccine provides complete protection. Perhaps the authors could have elaborated on the current very bleak situation of COVID 19 vaccination, which would have led to further strengthening the vaccination rate, which would have been in line with the logic of the article's argument.</p> <p>#2. The authors strongly recommend an extensive qualitative study in order to seek better community insights &amp; perceptions regarding this public health issue. This suggestion seems rushed. The authors need to add further points of innovation and limitations of this paper to provide a basis for future researchers to conduct a qualitative study. Of course, the authors would also do well to elaborate on what kind of qualitative research to conduct.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The authors believed that such doubts among the community necessitate that some counselling sessions be conducted to remove common people's uncertainties. However, it is doubtful that the counselling sessions will effectively reverse the motivation of community people for vaccination. This is because the decision of community people to be vaccinated is likely to be influenced by the opinions of the people around them. Counselling sessions can also only provide an uncertain reference option. Based on humanity, the most effective way to motivate community people to get vaccinated is to show them the good results of vaccination openly and thoroughly and promote this achievement. In this way, community people would be more motivated to get vaccinated.	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zehua Feng
Department, University & Country	Guangdong University of Finance & Economics, China