

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_100899
Title of the Manuscript:	TWO YEARS AFTER THE ROLLOUT OF COVID-19 VACCINES, HAS HESITANCY CHANGED?
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.journalajrn.com/index.php/AJRNH/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The article on the topic of hesitancy about vaccination can be important for the scientific community. Because this doubt exists in many developed countries. It is very important to examine and resolve these doubts in the nations and governments of the world for the next epidemic. The issue of respect and adherence of all people and organizations to collective safety and global health rules is very important. And it is created through transparency and trust building by global health organizations and scientists. 2- It seems that the title of the article is better as a news sentence (declarative sentence) than a question sentence. The result of the article is still a question, just like the title of the article. 3- In general, the structure of the abstract is appropriate, but the WHO report needs to be modified. On 5 May 2023, the WHO Emergency Committee on COVID-19 recommended to the Director-General, who accepted the recommendation, that given the disease was by now well-established and ongoing, it no longer fit the definition of a PHEIC. This does not mean the pandemic itself is over, but the global emergency it has caused is, for now. Covid-19 is still a pandemic, but it is no longer a PHEIC. 4- Simple 5- Due to the lack of explanations, details, Surveys, reliable information and statistics in the article, about the reason for the public's doubt about vaccines and vaccination, the author should have at least prepared and presented his own questionnaires from the statistical population of his country, and at least the reason for the doubt Vaccination in the country was checked by a survey (according to the author, even culturally, religiously, etc.) Or it would have been better to study the prevalence and epidemic statistics of Covid-19 before and after vaccination in some countries, the effects and performance of the vaccine in different countries, which would have tangible and useful results. The philosophy of creating a vaccine and carrying out vaccination is to prevent and control the speed of disease outbreaks and epidemics. which has even often had a positive psychological impact in many societies. The author could even examine this issue from the point of view of psychology and the effect of advertising. This article has not given a clear and specific answer to this question. 6- There are more complete resources in this field 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	yes	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hamed Babaee
Department, University & Country	Payame Noor University (PNU), Iran