

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

Don E. Willis¹

¹ University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In paragraph four, the author claims public consensus has been achieved for other vaccines. I'm skeptical of this claim. Perhaps consensus is not the right word, but something a few steps down from that level of agreement?

Are the authors speaking globally, about Europe, Italy, the UK? It is unclear which is the focus--national, regional, or global.

The authors claim that regulators have not responded--or, rather, responded with ominous silence--to questions about the quality of oversight, but they do not cite any empirical analysis or source to back this claim. I am skeptical but I cannot check their sources on this claim because none are provided. Is this based on a search they have done personally or some more rigorous analysis? I agree it would be concerning if none of these institutions are willing to even respond, but I am not convinced that is the case based on the information (or lack thereof) provided in this article.

There is a statement about data sharing that suggests physicians should be allowed to independently confirm findings. Are most physicians trained in this kind of data analysis? My understanding is that most are not, and could in fact muddy the waters/create more confusion by conducting improper analysis if not properly trained in this type of research.

Overall, I am skeptical of several of the empirical claims made in this article that aren't backed with any references for me to check. However, if their underlying argument is simply that concerns about the safety and efficacy of vaccines must be addressed in good faith, rather than by quashing them without any serious engagement, this a reasonable argument. The article should be improved, though, by providing more information regarding some of the key empirical claims it makes, preferably with some peer-reviewed empirical analyses.