

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

Irene Kamenidou¹

¹ International Hellenic University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

REVIEW Qeios, CC-BY 4.0

Dear authors, while this paper is quite interesting, it cannot be published as it is at the moment and needs to undergo quite many changes.

Some suggestions for improving your paper are the following:

1. Please give for English proofreading.

ABSTRACT

1. Methods: who applied for what? For COVID related or other?
2. Methods: SPSS 18.0.0 = SPSS ver.18 or SPSS18
3. Methods: "the differences between the groups" what groups? Between what?
4. Results: "Of the total participants, 93.0% were vaccinated against COVID 19 **with more one more** doses in total,"
5. Results: "93.0% were vaccinated against COVID 19 with more one more doses in total, 64.5% with 2 doses and 19.4% with 3 doses. The one-dose rate was significantly higher than the world average of 70%." $93+64.5+19.4=176\%$. This question cannot be a yes-no question. They either have 1 or 2 or 3 vaccines or 0 vaccines... therefore you need to rephrase. those with 2&3 doses= 83.9 . what % is the 1 dose exactly?
6. Results: "those who were vaccinated, 64.5% had received the Sinovac and 37.6% the Comirnaty vaccine"
 $64.5+37.6=102.1\%$

INTRODUCTION

1. The introduction needs to be rewritten. It is like reading the same that we read in the abstract. And at the end objective is in bold with ":"
2. Build your case from general to specific in order to state aim and objectives.
3. objectives : "The current study aims to investigate the vaccine uptake, intention to accept the COVID-19 vaccines and vaccine hesitancy rates in the society of Northern Cyprus and associated factors" but in the method section we have a **perception and attitude scale** and **knowledge assessment**.... there are no objectives on perception, attitudes and

knowledge.

METHODS

1. The methodology section needs to be re-written and be more in depth
2. Please provide with a table that refers to the (each) questions and the scales used. If questions come from previous research, please provide with references where this applies. e.g. Perceptions: 8 statements adopted from.... 7-point Likert Scale
3. Sampling: "The reason for applying a non-probability sampling method was the fact that this clinic was relatively larger in size compared to others and was providing comprehensive primary healthcare services in the region, addressing a broad variety of the population" This is not a reason for applying a non-probability sampling method. You should probably delete this. Just say that you used a non-probability sampling method at the largest clinic in the region.
4. Data collection tool and method: "The next section comprises 18 questions about the participants' perceptions and attitudes of COVID-19 vaccination." Please provide from where with the statements were adopted from and the scale measurement
5. "The last 8 questions are on the knowledge of COVID-19 and COVID-19 vaccines." Please provide from where with the statements were adopted from and the scale measurement
6. Analysis of the Data: "The differences between the groups were evaluated" please tell us about what groups are we talking about
7. For questions that use Likert scale provide with reliability measures if this is plausible
8. validity of measures
9. please back up your methodology with references.

RESULTS:

1. You have a large table for the demographics that you could just put in words and you do not have table for the 18+8 questions that are the focus of the paper, i.e., participants' perceptions and attitudes of COVID-19 vaccination + 8 of the knowledge of COVID-19 and COVID-19 vaccines
2. There is a need to see the tables here with MS, std and probably medians.
3. Please see the tables. E.g., table 2 the % do not add up to 100%. This is probably a yes-no question so you have to have a column for no and whc add to 100.0% horizontally.
4. table 3: As I know you cant have different vaccines. All must be the same at least in other countries– see what they add up to >100.0%
5. One table should contain one issue not more. The number of doses and no difficulty in obtaining one could be put in words
6. Table 4. How many crosstabs were tested? Are these the ones that have $p < 0.05$ in 2
7. How was correct knowledge assessed? Was it subjective knowledge or objective knowledge? And scale used- adopted from.
8. "Table 3 shows the COVID-19 vaccination status of the participants" please put this before the table 3 not after table 4

9. You have to state your specific objectives and answer them one by one in the results section. This means that results answer per aim and objective
10. Discussion: "In the general population, the lowest rates of vaccine confidence were found in Hong Kong (4.2-38%)," what does 4.2 correspond to? Is it a mean score of something?

CONCLUSION

1. results (numbers) should be in the result section
2. Provide with the limitations of the study and directions for future research.

Ethical statement