

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_83954
Title of the Manuscript:	CLINICAL HEALTH COMPLICATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH COVID-19 VACCINATION
Type of the 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:

(<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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p><u>Introduction</u>. The introduction is a little confusing. The first part of the introduction should contain general information (about the disease) and then slowly narrow down to the main topic of the paper (complications of the vaccine) (p. 1-2, line: 16-40).</p> <p><u>Research Questions</u>. Does this study also look at the types of complications? Or are we looking for an answer to only one question (Were there complications or not?). From what has been written, it is only a list of answers (yes and no), and the questionnaire should then contain only one question. Of course, this must be formulated more clearly and concretely (p. 2, line: 54-55).</p> <p><u>Tools for Data Collection</u>. It is necessary to briefly describe the questionnaire. What does it consist of, what scale was used? (p. 3, line: 67) It must be stated what statistical procedures were performed and what the values are. It cannot be stated only descriptively without statistically clear values (p. 3, line: 67-69). It is necessary to describe in detail the distribution of the questionnaire (p. 3, line: 69). Specify exactly which population group is involved (vaccinated constables). Was consent obtained from the respondents to participate in the survey before filling out the questionnaire? (p. 3, line: 70)</p> <p><u>Presentation and analysis of data</u>. The data analysis is too simple. It would be good to link these data with sociodemographic data. Similarly, it would be good to see an association of health complications with respondents who did not volunteer to be vaccinated. Are they more likely to experience complications than respondents who did get vaccinated voluntarily, etc.? If there is information on the type of vaccine used to vaccinate the respondents, it would be good to indicate that as well. If different vaccines were used, they should be associated with the type of difficulty (p. 3-4, line: 76-78). How do you know that the problems were caused by psychological consequences? Where is the connection? (p. 4, line: 79-81)</p> <p><u>Discussion</u>. There is a lack of discussion on this topic and comparison with previously published research on this topic (p. 4, line: 82).</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u>. The conclusion must be clear and concrete. If the statistical analysis of the data is strengthened, the conclusion will also be stronger (p. 4, line: 84-85).</p> <p><u>Recommendations</u>. The recommendations are not consistent with the entire paper. The benefits of vaccination were not mentioned in the paper (p. 4, line: 87-89).</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p><u>Abstract</u>. The abstract must be edited after the entire paper has been edited (p. 1, line: 6-13).</p> <p><u>Objective of the Problem</u>. The goal is vaguely formulated. What is to be evaluated? Was it perhaps the occurrence of complications? (p. 2, line: 48-49)</p> <p><u>Methodology</u>. Has approval been obtained from the Punjab Motorway Lahore Pakistan Ethics Committee? If yes (and it should be), then this should be stated in the methodology (p. 3, line: 62).</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>Data Analysis. In addition to the statistical program, the type of statistical analysis used must also be indicated (p. 3, line: 73-74).</p> <p><u>References</u>. It is necessary to check the writing style of the references and harmonize them. Some references are technically written incorrectly (p. 4-6, line: 91-146).</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>This research is very interesting. I have no doubt that this article will be great when it is finished.</p>	

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Has the approval of the Ethics Committee of Punjab Motorway Lahore Pakistan been obtained for conducting the research?</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rahela Orlandini
Department, University & Country	University of Split, Croatia