

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_95009
Title of the Manuscript:	Mitigating COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy and Improving Uptake in Anambra State South-East Nigeria.
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:

<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> This is an interesting paper about vaccine hesitancy. Although the work was made in Nigeria, I am quite sure the same conclusions can be extended to other countries, therefore this is an important study in the field that should be published. Yes, the title is suitable. Yes, however I would suggest a revision in "Results" section to make it clearer. Yes. Yes. The references are both sufficient and recent. Nothing to add. There are only few things I would like to point out: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Item 2.3 Study population – "The participants were of both sexes, aged from 18 to 65 years." Sounds better; Table 2, item "no reason/nothing" – missing % Tables 3 and 4 (first part) - Suggestion: place in descending order of percentage to facilitate interpretation and decision making. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes, Although I don't feel comfortable giving an opinion on this, as English is not my mother tongue.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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:	Wagner Quintilio
Department, University & Country	Butantan Institute, Brazil