

Review of: "Perceptions and Attitudes about COVID-19 Vaccines Regarding Vaccine Intention and Hesitancy of Attendants of a Healthcare Center in Northern Cyprus"

Zewdu MGebremariam¹

¹ Ethiopian Medical Association

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

First and foremost, I would like to thank the journal editor for inviting me to review this manuscript entitled **"Perceptions and attitudes about COVID-19 Vaccines Intention and Hesitancy of Attendants of the Healthcare center in Northern Cyprus"**, a similar research title that I have worked on and published. I also admire the author for coming up with such a current global health issue to evaluate the attitude and perceptions about covid-19 vaccine acceptance and the matters in the current study area.

As a reviewer of this manuscript, I pointed out my comments and recommendations as follows:

Title

- The title should be more concise and specific to certain variables, and it needs to avoid redundant and mutually opposite variables.
- Firstly, the details of the manuscript deal with COVID-19 vaccine acceptance and the level of knowledge, attitude, and perceptions among healthcare attendants as its contributing factors. So, the author needs to improve the title in a self-explanatory manner.
- Secondly, why vaccine intention and hesitancy are not required terms in the title if perceptions and attitude towards covid-19 vaccine acceptance are measured? Vaccine hesitancy is a mutually opposite variable to vaccine acceptance. Does the author understand 'vaccine intention' is different from 'perception of covid-19 vaccination'? If so, how can 'vaccine intention' be measured in the study?

Abstract

- In the background section, there is an issue of clarity about a statement stating "Hence, knowledge of attitudes and perceptions of vaccination..... Is there any type of variable called knowledge of attitudes and matters?"
- On the methods part, the study subjects should be clearly defined. Who are the 'other attendants'? The authors should include the sampling technique and the statistical model used. In this section, the author stated, "The difference between the groups were evaluated using the chi square test, with the significance level set as $p < 0,05$ ". There is nothing explained in the background and objectives of the study about different groups of the study participants. Does the author intend to conduct comparative cross-sectional study?
- In the results section, it needs grammatical edition.
- In the conclusion, it is not in a position to respond answer the main objective of the study. There are no inferences drawn from the findings in the conclusion.

Main manuscript

- In the Introduction, avoid inconsistencies. The main objective should be in line with the title and the primary objective. The objective here says "to investigate vaccine uptake, intention to accept the covid-19 vaccines and vaccine hesitancy rates in the society of Northern Cyprus"; where the attitude and perceptions towards covid-19 were avoided here in the objective.
- In the Methods Section: in needs reorganization and additional subheadings are required in the method section. For instance, sampling is also part of methods. However, if was mentioned differently, the method section needs sub-headings such as the 'study area, period and design' prior to sampling. The dependent variable was not clearly stated and operationally defined in a specific and measurable manner. The author differentiates attitude as a parcel of the outcome variable and knowledge as an independent factor. However, nothing is stated about how covariates are controlled. What are the criteria to measure the economic status of HHs as 'high'," Middle", and "low"? It needs operational definition. How was intention measured as an independent factor? Needs clarification. The author should include the criteria to measure vaccine hesitancy and vaccine acceptance if they are different perspectives. Attitude and knowledge were measured by the same 8 questions in table 4. However, these variables are not the same. In addition, attitude was a part and parcel of the primary outcome variable, as knowledge was an independent factor in this study. The author should answer this question.
- In the outcome measurement section, the outcome measurement was not in a position to respond to the main objective. Therefore, it should be directly in line with the title and the objective of the study.
- Data Collection Tool and Method, how was data collection tools validated? There is a concern about the validity and reliability of the data collection tool. The author should mention what was taken regarding this issue.
- Analysis of the data: The authors should include the statistical model used very well.
- Result section: Results and tables should be written up and described in a standard manner.

Additional Comments

- The author should include the strengths and limitations of the study.
- No recommendation mentioned. Recommendations should be indicated in line with the study findings.
- The author should emphasis the implications of the results in the conclusion.



