

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_77095
Title of the Manuscript:	A survey on factors influencing COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy in the Bamenda-Cameroon
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The article is missing the literature review in the manuscript (not necessarily as a separate section, but in terms of contents). Perhaps there are other relevant similar studies conducted for other cities in Cameroon? Definitely, there are for other African countries. Up to date, there have been many well-published studies on vaccine acceptance/hesitancy, indeed most from European countries, but not exclusively. They offer a lot of insight into the anti-vaccine decision and would put the present research into perspective.</p> <p>As for the determinants of COVID-vaccine acceptance, two studies are cited, one from Malaysia one from Cameroon. There have been a lot more recent and extensive (and experimental) studies on that topic. Cultural aspects impact such decisions, too, so citing Malaysia and Cameroon in one line without any comment trivializes the complexity of this topic. Putting one's research topic into perspective is crucial in reporting new data for any research topic.</p> <p>To name a few: Afolabi, A. A., & Ilesanmi, O. S. (2021). Dealing with vaccine hesitancy in Africa: the prospective COVID-19 vaccine context. <i>The Pan African medical journal</i>, 38, 3. Machingaidze, S., Wiysonge, C.S. Understanding COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy. <i>Nat Med</i>27, 1338–1339 (2021). Acheampong, T., Akorsikumah, E. A., Osae-Kwapong, J., Khalid, M., Appiah, A., & Amuasi, J. H. (2021). Examining Vaccine Hesitancy in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Survey of the Knowledge and Attitudes among Adults to Receive COVID-19 Vaccines in Ghana. <i>Vaccines</i>, 9(8), 814 Kachurka, R., Krawczyk, M., & Rachubik, J. (2021). Persuasive Messages Will Not Increase COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance: Evidence from a Nationwide Online Experiment. <i>Vaccines</i>, 9(10), 1113. Bitar, A.N.; Zawiah, M.; Al-Ashwal, F.Y.; Kubas, M.; Saeed, R.M.; Abduljabbar, R.; Jaber, A.A.S.; Sulaiman, S.A.S.; Khan, A.H. Misinformation, Perceptions Towards COVID-19 and Willingness to be Vaccinated: A Population-Based Survey in Yemen. <i>bioRxiv</i> 2021 Serra-Garcia, M.; Szech, N. Choice Architecture and Incentives Increase COVID-19 Vaccine Intentions and Test Demand.</p> <p>The info on vaccine efficacy is outdated (from 2020 or from five months ago). Many new studies have talked about the empirically verified effectiveness, not the one which the producers initially announced. It is of the utmost importance to pay attention to such details as scientists and give the most updated info possible. Perhaps the article was written already some time ago, but regardless, the statistics and facts used in the Intro should all be updated. Same- info from July about the rates of vaccinated people or from June about confirmed cases.</p> <p>The vaccine acceptance rate from July for Cameroon is given, but not for Bamenda, and the study is on population from Bamenda. (then I saw you mention the vaccination rate in the Northwest region in the discussion section; thus, that should be included/moved to the Intro section (with a mention of how Bamenda and Northwest region relate to each other for a foreigner to be aware).</p> <p>Page 3: "The survey questions were adapted and modified from previously published literature." This sentence was adapted and not modified from citation nr.5. Nonetheless- the authors should list this previously published literature from which their questionnaire was adapted to, firstly, give credit to initial authors, secondly, allow the readers to verify the initial source of the wording.</p> <p>There are fragments where sentence after sentence is taken from cited sources. Mainly a lot of entire sentences are taken from Ferdous MZ, Islam MS, Sikder MT, Mosaddek ASM, Zegarra-Valdivia JA, Gozal D. Knowledge, attitude, and practice regarding COVID-19 outbreak in Bangladesh: An onlinebased cross-sectional study. <i>PLoS One</i>. 2020;15(10):1–29. And Syed Alwi SAR, Rafidah E, Zurraini A, Juslina O, Brohi IB, Lukas S. A survey on COVID-19 vaccine acceptance and concern among Malaysians. <i>BMC Public Health</i>. 2021;21(1):1–12.</p> <p>The Discussion section could be improved in the sense that it could be less the summary of the results but a more flowing discussion.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>Table layouts should be improved for better readability.</p> <p>Data collection tool: how was the questionnaire pre-tested? No mention of that. Who were the data collectors? How many of them were there? Did the authors check for the “interviewer effect” in the responses in the main dependent variables?</p> <p>The questionnaire was written in English but was it only administered in English, or any translations took place?</p> <p>Page 5: “A total of 2531 participants were recruited for the study” How were the subjects recruited? Were they chosen or self-selected? Did they get paid for participation? Out of 2531, everyone fully filled out the questionnaire? There were no missing observations? Were no observations excluded from the whole sample? What was the refusal-to-participate rate?</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>The sample size is calculated based on Cameroon population size, but as I understand from what the authors write, the studied population is that of Bamenda. Is the population of Bamenda representative of the population of the whole Cameroon under socio-demographic factors? If not, then the studied population is the Bamenda population, not Cameroon.</p> <p>Is the socio-demographic structure of the sample in the study representative of the population of Bamenda? No mention of that.</p> <p>If the analyses are done on a complete sample of 2531, as suggested by the first sentence of RESULTS, there is no need to add the frequencies in the text each time the percentage is given. It would allow for a smoother read-through.</p> <p>For the readability of the tables, I would suggest first giving the percentages, then the frequencies.</p> <p>I don't understand the meaning of the asterisks in Table 2 and that table's comment.</p> <p>Figure 1 doesn't have any value-added, it only takes space. The first sentence of the “Perception towards the COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy” section is enough if the percentage for the uncertain ones is added.</p> <p>Throughout the text, sometimes a dot, sometimes a comma, is used for decimals.</p> <p>The article should be proofread as there are multiple simple language mistakes/typos.</p> <p>Discussion sentence “Remarkably, COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy is also strongly related to the fact that the vaccine is being offered free considering the importance of the vaccine”. There is no citation to that statement, and I didn't see anything about this in this study's results. Were the participants asked about that? For example, but not exclusively, Krawczyk and Rachubik investigated different pricing options in “Persuasive Messages Will Not Increase COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance: Evidence from a Nationwide Online Experiment,” as possibly impacting the willingness to vaccinate. Some studies from African countries also asked the participants about that.</p> <p>On page 9, for example (in other places too), the authors write: “Our data revealed that variables significantly associated with hesitancy (at $p < 0.05$) in the univariate analysis include (...), individuals with monthly income > 100,000 FCFA”, in the Discussion the authors write: “(...)those with a higher monthly income of > 100,000 FCFA will accept the vaccine”.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall that's an interesting and important study and a scientifically written article that could benefit from a significant revision but with easily repairable deficiencies.</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Joanna Rachubik
Department, University & Country	University of Warsaw, Poland