

Review of: "Mandatory vaccinations, the segregation of citizens and promotion of inequality in the modern democracy of Greece. Is science allowed to "enforce" or silently back-up such policies?"

Giorgio Airoidi

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

The article addresses the interesting issue of vaccination effectiveness in controlling covid-19 pandemics, and it is thus of much potential interest. The references are relevant and abundant, and represent in themselves an interesting contribution to the discussion.

The only problem with the article is that it lacks a clear introduction that explains what is the thesis it defends and a clear structure to guide the reader through the discussion. Many things are claimed, but what is the central point of the authors? Why are data from different countries used and to defend what? I would suppose that the article is a criticism of Greece policy regarding mandatory vaccination for healthcare workers, but it could be a criticism of vaccination 'green passes' as unscientific in general, or specifically as cause of social segregation. There is maybe too much content in the article and too little structure.

If so, if the criticism is focused on Greece, the policy should be explained first: readers not familiar with how Greece managed the pandemics (like myself) might not have that information. Once the criticism and its target are explained, the different sections of the paper should be linked to each other so that the reader can easily follow the discussion.

Having said all this, I hope my comments are somehow useful to the authors. I really liked reading this article and I hope that it will gain the attention it deserves.