

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 manuscript is highly significant for the scientific community as it addresses a critical gap in understanding the factors influencing COVID-19 vaccination among pregnant women in Senegal, a population often underrepresented in global vaccination studies. By focusing on the Thies health district, the study provides valuable regional data that can inform tailored public health strategies in similar settings. The findings, particularly regarding the roles of decision-making autonomy, vaccine knowledge, and perceived importance, contribute to the broader discourse on vaccine hesitancy and acceptance, especially in low- and middle-income countries. Furthermore, the study’s emphasis on a vulnerable group during the pandemic highlights key sociocultural and logistical barriers to vaccine uptake, which are crucial for designing equitable healthcare interventions.	Thank you for this comment.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The current title, “Factors associated with COVID-19 vaccination among pregnant women in the health district of Thies, Senegal, in 2023,” is suitable in that it provides essential information about the population, topic, and setting. However, it is somewhat lengthy and could be more engaging. While it effectively conveys the study’s focus, it does not emphasize the analytical nature of the research or the implications of its findings.</p> <p>Suggested Alternative Title</p> <p>“Understanding COVID-19 Vaccination Uptake Among Pregnant Women in Senegal: Barriers, Drivers, and Insights from Thies District (2023)”</p> <p>This alternative title combines clarity, specificity, and engagement by highlighting both the study’s focus on vaccine uptake and the key themes of barriers and motivators. It also frames the study as an exploration of insights, which broadens its appeal to the scientific community and policymakers.</p>	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>The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive and provides a clear overview of the study's objectives, methodology, key findings, and conclusions. However, it could be further refined to improve clarity, ensure balance, and make it more engaging for the reader. Below are specific suggestions:</p> <p>Strengths of the Abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Clear Objectives: The abstract effectively outlines the purpose of the study, which is to identify factors influencing COVID-19 vaccination among pregnant women in the Thies health district.2. Methodology Overview: It briefly describes the study design, sample size, and analysis methods, which is essential for transparency.3. Key Findings: It highlights important results, such as the vaccination coverage rate and the factors associated with vaccination.4. Relevance of the Conclusion: The conclusion emphasizes the need for tailored strategies to improve vaccination rates, aligning with the study's objectives. <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Omission of Certain Details:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Descriptive Statistics in Detail: The abstract currently includes unnecessary details, such as the mean age of participants (28.36 ± 6.7 years), which could be removed for brevity.• Overlapping Information: Phrases such as “belief in the importance and usefulness was 76.4%” could be streamlined, as the main focus is the association between these beliefs and vaccination.2. Addition of Key Information:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contextual Background: The abstract could briefly mention why the vaccination of pregnant women is a critical issue in Senegal and globally, especially in the context of the pandemic.• Emphasis on Methods: While the methodology is mentioned, the abstract does not clarify how participants were selected, which is an important detail.• Key Statistics on Vaccination: The overall vaccination rate (54.2%) is mentioned, but the abstract could briefly explain its significance compared to national or global rates.• Policy Implications: The conclusion could be strengthened by briefly specifying actionable strategies or broader implications of the findings.3. Language and Structure:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some sentences are overly detailed or repetitive. Simplifying these would make the abstract more concise and easier to read.• The abstract lacks a clear transition between sections, such as objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. <p>Suggested Revised Abstract:</p> <p>Introduction: The COVID-19 pandemic has disproportionately impacted global health systems, and vaccination remains a critical strategy to mitigate its effects. However, vaccination rates among pregnant women, particularly in low- and middle-income countries, remain understudied. This study aimed to identify factors influencing COVID-19 vaccination among pregnant women in the Thies health district, Senegal.</p> <p>Methods: This cross-sectional study involved 736 pregnant women attending antenatal care in public health facilities in Thies. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire and analyzed using R software. Descriptive statistics, bivariate analyses, and logistic regression models were used to identify factors associated with vaccination.</p> <p>Results: COVID-19 vaccination coverage among pregnant women was 54.2%. Factors significantly associated with vaccination included advanced age, decision-making autonomy (AOR=4.24), knowledge of vaccines (AOR=15.3), and perceptions of the vaccine's importance (AOR=3.26) and usefulness (AOR=2.98). However, perceived risk of vaccination was also associated with uptake (AOR=4.50).</p> <p>Conclusion: Improving COVID-19 vaccination among pregnant women requires tailored interventions addressing knowledge gaps, decision-making autonomy, and risk perceptions. These findings highlight</p>	<p>Thank you for the remark; corrections will be made to this section.</p>
--	---	--

Review Form 3

	the importance of context-specific strategies to enhance vaccine acceptance and coverage in similar settings.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically correct as it follows appropriate research methodologies, including a clear study design, data collection through validated tools, and robust statistical analyses (descriptive statistics, bivariate analysis, and logistic regression). The findings align with global trends and existing literature on factors influencing COVID-19 vaccination. Ethical considerations and limitations are acknowledged, adding to its credibility. However, minor revisions for clarity and emphasis on policy implications would further strengthen its scientific rigor.	Thank you for the remark; we will make the necessary revisions.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<p>The references cited in the manuscript are generally sufficient and include relevant sources from reputable organizations such as the World Health Organization (WHO) and peer-reviewed journals. They provide a strong foundation for the study's context and findings. However, there are a few points to consider:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Many references are recent, particularly those related to COVID-19 vaccination campaigns and guidelines, ensuring relevance to the study.The inclusion of systematic reviews and meta-analyses strengthens the manuscript's foundation. <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Limited Regional References: While some studies from Africa are cited, the inclusion of more region-specific research (e.g., West Africa or Senegal) on vaccine hesitancy or maternal health could provide additional context.Missing Recent Global Data: The manuscript references vaccination statistics and strategies from 2020-2022. Including more recent vaccination coverage data or findings from 2023 would enhance relevance. <p>Suggested Additional References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Recent studies or reviews on vaccine hesitancy in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), particularly in Africa.<ul style="list-style-type: none">For example, studies exploring vaccine acceptance trends in pregnant women globally or regionally.Research on strategies to improve maternal health decision-making autonomy in LMICs. <p>Including more region-specific and 2023 data would better support the manuscript's conclusions and contextualize its findings.</p>	Thank you for the remark; we will add these articles to enhance the discussion.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	Thank you for this comment.
Optional/General comments	N/A	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	