Peer Review Report

Review Report on COVID-19 vaccine acceptability among healthcare facility workers in Sierra Leone, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Uganda: a cross-sectional survey

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Mark Okwir
Submitted on: 05 Aug 2022
Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1605113

EVALUATION

Q 1 **Please summarize the main findings of the study.**

The paper discussed acceptability of COVID vaccine which is the main public health concerns as of today, fears, believes, perception, uptake; in a multicenter study, in rural African centers where vaccination hesitance is reportedly high.

The study was done among health care facility workers. A qualitative survey in nature, using questionaire/interviewers approach.

The paper teased out some aspects of the factors associated with vaccine (acceptability, hesitancy or uptake, perceptions and knowledge) which is key in public health interventions

No person was vaccinated in Coma, even though the percieved willingness to vaccinate was high.

Q 2 **Please highlight the limitations and strengths.**

The strength of the paper; its a multicenter study, its novel and issues discussed are critical for public health interventions against covid-19.

Limitations: The study was a survey, qualitative method, but the best method would have been mixed method.
Comparisons of variables between the were not succinct and clear.
Some Sentences had no clear meaning "hanging sentences"
Key words were not Defined
Discussion is bulky and unfocused

Q 3 **Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.**

Please refer to the attached document for details of the review and recommendations made

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 **Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?**

Its captivative, although a small addition was suggested to make it attractive

Q 5 **Are the keywords appropriate?**

Key words were undefined, it was left to the reader to assume, although they appeared appropriate

Q 6 **Is the English language of sufficient quality?**

YES

Q 7 **Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?**

Yes.

Q 8 **Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)**

The referrences were relevant, although there were some sentences which where unreferrenced

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9	Originality	■■■■■
Q 10	Rigor	■■■■□
Q 11	Significance to the field	■■■■■
Q 12	Interest to a general audience	■■■■□
Q 13	Quality of the writing	■■■□□
Q 14	Overall scientific quality of the study	■■■□□

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 **Please make a recommendation based on your comments:**

Minor revisions.