Review of: "[Viewpoint] Vaccination campaigns against Covid-19 may promote vaccine hesitancy toward well-established, safe, and effective vaccines"

Simeon Jr Bernados[1]

1 Cebu Technological University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Can non-exclusionary open debate and availability of raw data prevent vaccine hesitancy?

The presence of accessible and comprehensive data, coupled with transparent and candid discourse regarding research outcomes concerning vaccine efficacy, stands as a pivotal dual imperative in the endeavor to mitigate vaccine hesitancy. In conjunction with these imperatives, the meticulous oversight of information promulgation within communities, along with the strategic and efficacious dispersion of pertinent information, emerges as an additional sine qua non within any comprehensive vaccination campaign [1]. Empirical inquiries have underscored the discernible role of pseudoscientific parlance as a contributory facet fostering vaccine hesitancy[2] . Within the present scholarly discourse, it is incumbent upon the authors **to contemplate an inquiry into the dynamics of information propagation and the regulatory mechanisms governing the realm of misinformation and disinformation.**

Entities sanctioned or endorsed by governmental authorities typically assume the mantle of disseminating information pertaining to the efficacy of vaccines. In congruence with this role, these entities bear the responsibility of shaping policies or offering recommendations that guide the actions and enforcement endeavors of regulatory bodies. Moreover, the information promulgated by these entities often remains unsubjected to comprehensive public scrutiny; instead, an implicit pledge of well-informed decision-making, fortified by empirical evidence, is proffered. Nevertheless, notwithstanding the manifold preemptive measures undertaken by regulatory authorities, the diffusion of erroneous and fabricated information continues to proliferate within communities, a trend notably exacerbated during episodes of lockdown mandates.

In context of the extant article, the principal contention has been expounded with a degree of adequacy. Nevertheless, it remains imperative that substantiating data be proffered for each assertion posited – a likely multitude, one may posit – to illuminate the trajectory of discourse for the readership. To augment the scholarly potency of the paper, I am inclined to proffer the **recommendation of segregating discussions that are inherently "Naturalistic'** from those that **encompass socio-political dimensions.** Even in the presence of robust scientific substantiation, it is germane to recognize that the realization of recommended actions is intricately interwoven with socio-political underpinnings[3].

Recommendations:

As the author suggests open debate without exclusions and availability of raw data, I think that, at this point, authors need

to offer agenda or "talking points" for discussion. Adopting an open agenda may lead the discussion to nowhere.

References

1. ^Will Jennings, Gerry Stoker, Hannah Willis, Viktor Valgardsson, et al. (2021). _Lack of trust and social media echo chambers predict COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy._ doi:10.1101/2021.01.26.21250246.

2. ^Simeon Bernados, Lanndon Ocampo. (2022). _How Do People Decide on Getting Vaccinated? Evaluating the COVID-19 Vaccination Program through the Lens of Social Capital Theory._ Social Sciences, vol. 11 (4), 145. doi:10.3390/socsci11040145.

3. ^Janaki Imbulana Arachchi, Shunsuke Managi. (2021). _The role of social capital in COVID-19 deaths._ BMC Public Health, vol. 21 (1). doi:10.1186/s12889-021-10475-8.