

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Vaccine literacy and Vaccination: A systematic review

Review, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Reviewer 2

Submitted on: 28 Nov 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605606

### EVALUATION

#### **Q 1** Please summarize the main theme of the review.

As the authors stated, "This systematic review aims to present the latest findings in the relationship between vaccination literacy and vaccination, including vaccine hesitancy, vaccination attitudes, vaccination intentions, and vaccine uptake. The objective is to provide fresh perspectives for preventing or intervening in vaccine hesitancy and to fully mobilize the initiative and incentives for vaccination to play a more significant role in preventing and controlling infectious illnesses."

#### **Q 2** Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

A strength is that the authors chose to focus on a timely and important topic. The limitations, in my view, is that the authors do not convincingly engage with the literature on vaccine hesitancy and vaccine uptake to fully situate vaccine literacy within the larger puzzle of the complex determinants of vaccine (non)uptake. The authors state, lines 29–32, that vaccine hesitancy is the primary driver for the decline in vaccination rates and outbreaks of vaccine preventable diseases. I don't think we are getting the full picture, and I would encourage the authors to engage with critical literature that points to other issues (i.e. access, pragmatics, adequate access to vaccination services) (see citation below):

Bedford, H., Attwell, K., Danchin, M., Marshall, H., Corben, P., & Leask, J. (2018, 2018/10/22/). Vaccine hesitancy, refusal and access barriers: The need for clarity in terminology. *Vaccine*, 36(44), 6556–6558. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2017.08.004>

The authors state on page 5: "Excluded were papers that reported solely on vaccination literacy or vaccine literacy scores." This seems to be a limitation because authors then otherwise missed out on how other researchers are measuring vaccine literacy and examining the conclusions that they can make in these other studies. This choice for exclusion needs to be further justified.

#### **Q 3** Please provide your detailed review report to the authors, structured in major and minor comments.

Although the paper is interesting, it has some major room for improvements.

The section "Measurement of vaccination literacy" (lines 238 and onwards) would be more appropriate to include in the introduction section of the document.

P. 2, line 25, avert should be "prevent"

As previously stated, the introduction section needs to better situate the discussion of vaccine literacy as a concept with the large body of literature on vaccine hesitancy and vaccine uptake. The authors should also attempt to make it clear that vaccine hesitancy and vaccine literacy are not the only determinants of vaccination uptake.

P. 2, line 40: the reference that this refers to is misspelled in the bibliography: Sørensen

P. 2–3, lines 42–43; the end of this sentence is not clear to me. It would likely be helpful for the reader to reformulate for clarity.

P. 3, line 55–56: "opportunity to enhance vaccine resistance" I'm not sure what this means. This could probably be reformulated.

P. 3, lines 57–58: "VL will likely be the most promising instrument for combating vaccination hesitancy" ; As VL has been defined and explained conceptually so far in the paper, it seems to me that this statement is too strong since VL has not been adequately defined. How concretely will VL be an instrument for combating vaccination hesitancy?

P. 5, lines 66–67: "to fully mobilize the initiative and incentives for vaccination to play a more significant role in preventing and controlling infectious illnesses" I'm not exactly sure what this means concretely. This could be reformulated for clarity, likely by breaking the sentence into 2–3 clearer sentences.

Line 77: "from inception" – this is not clear to me

Line 91: "Covidence tool" What is this?

Line 162: "moms" should be "mothers"

Line 217: "grade," would "score" be more appropriate?

Line 273: "The improvement of VL in the entire population helps the public recognize the of vaccination..."

This sentence/statement needs a reference to back it up.

Line 298: "Sociocultural alters behavioural orientations" This is unclear to me. I think a word is missing.

Line 362–364: "Vaccine literacy is a critical ... and increasing vaccination rates." This sentence needs to be reformulated for clarity.

Regarding the overall aims/objectives, "his systematic review aims to present the latest findings in the relationship between vaccination literacy and vaccination, including vaccine hesitancy, vaccination attitudes, vaccination intentions, and vaccine uptake. The objective is to provide fresh perspectives for preventing or intervening in vaccine hesitancy and to fully mobilize the initiative and incentives for vaccination to play a more significant role in preventing and controlling infectious illnesses," I am not fully convinced that the authors have achieved these aims/objectives. The findings could be more clearly/explicitly articulated so that they align with the study objectives/aims.

#### PLEASE COMMENT

##### **Q 4** Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

There were some important references missing related to determinants of vaccine uptake that are not related to vaccine hesitancy or vaccine literacy. Authors' further engagement with this literature would likely nuance authors' main arguments, which seem to promote improved vaccination literacy as the be-all, end-all method for addressing vaccine access. I would appreciate authors' further engagement with this literature and to better situate vaccine literacy debates within the larger body of literature on vaccine hesitancy and determinants of vaccine uptake. The conceptual ties and links to health literacy could be discussed more in-depth as well.

##### **Q 5** Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)

No.

##### **Q 6** Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner

Yes.

##### **Q 7** Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?

No.

**Q 8** Does the review have international or global implications?

Yes

**Q 9** Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Maybe "Vaccine literacy and vaccination uptake" ?

**Q 10** Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

**Q 11** Is the English language of sufficient quality?

There is room for improvement

**Q 12** Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

#### QUALITY ASSESSMENT

**Q 13** Quality of generalization and summary

**Q 14** Significance to the field

**Q 15** Interest to a general audience

**Q 16** Quality of the writing

#### REVISION LEVEL

**Q 17** Please take a decision based on your comments:

Major revisions.