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**

<mark>**PART 1:**</mark> **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 provides critical insights into the factors influencing COVID-19 vaccination among pregnant women, a population often excluded from early vaccination campaigns and clinical trials. By focusing on the Thies health district in Senegal, it addresses a significant knowledge gap in understanding vaccine coverage and the sociocultural and logistical barriers affecting this vulnerable group in low-resource settings. The findings offer valuable data for public health policymakers to design tailored strategies that enhance vaccine uptake among pregnant women, ultimately contributing to improved maternal and neonatal health outcomes. Furthermore, the study adds to the growing body of evidence on vaccine acceptance, providing a foundation for future research and interventions in similar contexts globally.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**The title "Factors associated with COVID-19 vaccination among pregnant women in the health district of Thies, Senegal, in 2023" is clear and descriptive, effectively conveying the study's focus, population, and geographical scope. It provides relevant information to readers at a glance, making it suitable for publication.**	
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.	**The abstract of the article is comprehensive and well-structured, covering key aspects such as the study's background, objectives, methodology, main findings, and conclusions**	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct and makes a significant contribution to understanding factors influencing COVID-19 vaccination among pregnant women in Senegal. Minor revisions to improve methodological clarity, interpretation of results, and contextual discussion would further enhance its scientific quality	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript includes a robust and diverse set of references, with many recent and relevant sources addressing COVID-19 vaccination, its rollout, and factors influencing uptake. Foundational documents like WHO guidelines and systematic reviews strengthen the study's credibility. However, additional references could enhance the manuscript. For example, studies on vaccine uptake among pregnant women in similar African contexts, such as Kasozi et al. (2021), would provide valuable global comparisons. Similarly, references exploring vaccine hesitancy, like Larson et al. (2022), and societal factors influencing women's autonomy, such as Singh et al. (2020), would enrich the discussion. Overall, the references are sufficient but could be supplemented with targeted studies for greater depth.	

| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, with clear structure and terminology appropriate for academic readers. The manuscript effectively conveys its key points and findings. However, a few areas could benefit from refinement to enhance clarity and fluency:
 1. **Consistency and Grammar**
    o Minor grammatical errors and inconsistencies, such as subject-verb agreement and article usage (e.g., "the" vs. no article), could be corrected for better readability.
 2. **Scientific Tone**
    o Some sentences could be rephrased to adopt a more formal and concise tone, which is typical of scholarly writing. For example, "The study highlights that..." instead of "This study shows that..."
 3. **Clarity and Precision**
    o Certain phrases, such as "transport costs being not a barrier," could be made more precise (e.g., "transport costs did not significantly hinder vaccination uptake").
 4. **Flow and Transitions**
    o Improving the transitions between paragraphs in the Discussion section would enhance the logical flow of ideas and strengthen the argumentation. | |
| **Optional/General** comments | | |

	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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**R. K. Saran**
Department, University & Country	**Government Agriculture College, Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, India**