

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_130362
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors associated with COVID-19 vaccination among pregnant women in the health district of Thies, Senegal, in 2023
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study identifies key factors influencing COVID-19 vaccination uptake among pregnant women, offering critical insights to inform targeted interventions and health policies aimed at improving vaccination rates in vulnerable populations, particularly in low-resource settings. By addressing vaccine hesitancy and acceptance, the findings contribute to enhancing maternal and neonatal health outcomes and enrich the global understanding of COVID-19 vaccination during pregnancy. The research underscores the importance of culturally sensitive health communication and education strategies, providing valuable lessons for similar contexts worldwide. Ultimately, this work supports evidence-based approaches to strengthen public health efforts and safeguard maternal and fetal health during pandemics.	Thank you for this comment.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is informative but could be made more concise and engaging. A suitable alternative titles could be: 1. “Awareness and Attitudes Toward COVID-19 Vaccination Among Pregnant Women in the Thies Health District, Senegal (2023)” 2. “Examining Awareness and Attitudes of Pregnant Women on COVID-19 Vaccination in Thies, Senegal: A 2023 Study” 3. “ <u>COVID-19 Vaccination Awareness and Attitudes Among Pregnant Women in Thies, Senegal: Insights from 2023</u> ” 4. “Perceptions and Awareness of COVID-19 Vaccination Among Pregnant Women in Thies Health District, Senegal (2023)” 5. “Assessing Awareness and Attitudes Toward COVID-19 Vaccination Among Pregnant Women in Thies, Senegal: Findings from 2023”	Thank you for the remark; however, since the title is appropriate, we would prefer to keep it.

Review Form 3

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Revised Abstract Abstract Introduction: The global launch of COVID-19 vaccination in December 2020 marked a turning point in combating the pandemic. Pregnant women, a priority group due to their increased risk of severe outcomes and potential maternal-fetal protection, remain understudied in terms of vaccine uptake, particularly in low-resource settings. This study aimed to identify factors influencing COVID-19 vaccination among pregnant women in the Thies health district, Senegal. Methodology: A descriptive and analytical cross-sectional study was conducted among 736 pregnant women attending health facilities in Thies from January to March 2023. Participants were selected using [specify sampling method], and data were collected through a structured questionnaire. Data were analyzed using R software, including descriptive statistics, bivariate analyses, and multivariate logistic regression modeling. Results: Participants had a mean age of 28.36 ±6.7 years, with most being married (88.0%), educated (79.1%), and lacking income-generating activities (66.1%). Awareness of COVID-19 vaccination was reported by 67.0%, yet only 28.5% expressed confidence in the vaccines. While 76.4% believed in the importance and usefulness of vaccination, 58.0% perceived it as risky. Vaccine coverage was 54.2%. Multivariate analysis identified advanced age (AOR=1.04 [1.01-1.08]), decision-making autonomy (AOR=4.24 [2.40-7.75]), knowledge of vaccines (AOR=15.3 [9.58-25.2]), perceived importance (AOR=3.26 [1.19-8.98]), perceived usefulness (AOR=2.98 [1.17-7.78]), and perceived vaccine risk (AOR=4.50 [2.62-7.93]) as significant factors associated with vaccination. Conclusion: Tailored strategies addressing vaccine hesitancy, improving health education, and enhancing decision-making autonomy are essential to increase COVID-19 vaccination rates among pregnant women in Thies and similar settings. These findings highlight the need for culturally sensitive interventions to address barriers and promote vaccine acceptance in this vulnerable population.</p>	<p>Thank you for the remark; corrections will be made to this section.</p>
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically correct but would benefit from the suggested revisions to improve clarity, precision, and contextual depth. The revised abstract addresses these issues while maintaining the study's scientific rigor and relevance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Contextual Depth: The introduction could better emphasize why pregnant women are a priority group for COVID-19 vaccination (e.g., increased risk of severe outcomes, maternal-fetal protection).<ul style="list-style-type: none">Suggestion: Add a sentence like, <i>"Pregnant women are a priority group for vaccination due to their increased risk of severe COVID-19 outcomes and the potential for maternal-fetal protection."</i>2. Methodology:<ul style="list-style-type: none">Sampling Method: The abstract does not specify the sampling method used, which is critical for understanding the study's generalizability.<ul style="list-style-type: none">Suggestion: Specify the sampling method, e.g., <i>"Participants were selected using [specify sampling method, e.g., random sampling, convenience sampling]."</i>Software and Analysis: The phrase <i>"The analysis included a descriptive statistics"</i> is grammatically incorrect.<ul style="list-style-type: none">Suggestion: Revise to <i>"The analysis included descriptive statistics, bivariate analyses, and top-down logistic regression modeling."</i>3. Results:<ul style="list-style-type: none">Clarity and Precision: Some sentences could be more concise and precise. For example:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>"Those who were aware of the COVID-19 vaccination represented 67.0%."</i> → <i>"Awareness of COVID-19 vaccination was reported by 67.0% of participants."</i><i>"Belief in the importance and usefulness was 76.4%."</i> → <i>"76.4% of participants believed in the importance and usefulness of vaccination."</i>Risk Perception: The sentence <i>"Vaccination was perceived as risky by 58.0% and</i>	<p>Thank you for the remark; we will make the necessary revisions.</p>

Review Form 3

	<p><i>desirable by 74.2%."</i> could be clarified to avoid ambiguity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Suggestion: <i>"While 58.0% perceived vaccination as risky, 74.2% considered it desirable."</i> <p>4. Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contextualization: The discussion could better contextualize the findings within the broader literature, particularly in low-resource settings.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Suggestion: Add a sentence like, <i>"The findings align with studies from other low-resource settings, highlighting the importance of addressing vaccine hesitancy through targeted health education and community engagement."</i> <p>5. Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Specificity: The conclusion could be more specific about the identified factors and their implications.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Suggestion: <i>"Improving COVID-19 vaccination rates among pregnant women requires tailored strategies that address decision-making autonomy, knowledge gaps, and risk perceptions, particularly in low-resource settings like Thies."</i>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<p>While the references provided are relevant and cover important aspects of the study, adding more recent studies, particularly from 2020 and 2025, and focusing on similar geographical and socio-economic contexts would enhance the manuscript's robustness. This will not only improve the relevance of the references but also strengthen the overall conclusions drawn in the study</p> <p>1-https://doi.org/10.1080/21645515.2024.2383030 2- https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-024-19082-9 3-doi: 10.1111/1471-0528.17226 4-https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sciaf.2024.e02199</p>	Thank you for the remark; we will add more recent articles to improve the discussion.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>Overall, the manuscript is written in a suitable academic style, but it would benefit from revisions to improve clarity, coherence, and grammatical accuracy. By addressing the suggestions provided, the manuscript can achieve a higher standard of scholarly communication and effectively convey its findings to the intended audience. A thorough proofreading process and possibly seeking feedback from a colleague or a professional editor could also enhance the final quality of the manuscript.</p>	Thank you for the remark; we will revise it taking the suggestions into account.
Optional/General comments	<p>To improve the Manuscript language quality, you can utilize journal websites that offer language-editing services.</p> <p>Overall, the manuscript is valuable insights into the factors influencing COVID-19 vaccination among pregnant women in the Thies health district. With <i>major revisions</i> to enhance clarity and contextualization, it has the potential to make contribution to the literature on vaccination and public health in Senegal and similar contexts</p>	Okay

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	