

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Unraveling Herpes Zoster Vaccine Hesitancy, Acceptance, and Its Predictors: Insights from a Scoping Review

Review, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: António Machado

Submitted on: 04 May 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2024.1606679

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

The authors described the acceptance rates, intention rates, and hesitancy rates for herpes zoster vaccines exhibit significant variations on a global scale.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Low number of studies and the lack of more detailed information in some categories of the population set.

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

Reviewer report of the Manuscript ID 1606679

Congratulations on the present review! It was a very interesting work and I also learned what is a scoping review. Thank you.

General comments

The manuscript is very well-written, and, in my opinion, no major English Editing is needed.

The Supplementary Table S1 should be a principal table in the manuscript due to the importance of the summary information of the selected study set.

No major modifications are needed in my opinion, and I only suggest some rectifications to improve the manuscript. Please check my minor comments below.

Minor comments

Line 157- Supplementary Table S1 should be changed to a principal table 1. Also check the reference year of publication of "(Alhothali et al., n.d.)" and "(Al-Khalidi et al., n.d.)".

Lines 157- 159- The collected information or extracted data of the Excel spreadsheet should be added as supplementary material for replication purposes of the readers.

Please add the Figure titles, unfortunately, I did not find them.

Figure 3 please add the legend of the different colors in the plot of Figure 3 for the readers, as you did in Figure 4.

Table 2 - Please rectify the lines "a. media..." and b. geographical..." of the social environment category by starting the sentences with capital letters as previously done in other lines.

Lines 323-324- Please recommend the authors add the equivalent of "1600 yuan" in US dollars and explain the average income for middle-aged and elderly individuals for the non-familiar readers. However, it is a recommendation, and it is not mandatory.

Lines 333-334- Please merge the references and add the space between the last word and parentheses in "willingness(Maertzdorf et al., 2023) (Baalbaki et al., 2019) (MacDougall et al., 2015)".

Line 353- Please replace "DISCUSSIONS" with "DISCUSSION".

Line 389- Please add the space before the reference parentheses.

Line 411- Please delete the extra final dot in "recommended it. (P.-J. Lu et al., 2009)".

Line 415- Please delete the extra final dot before the reference parentheses.

Lines 431-432- Please rephrase the sentence.

PLEASE COMMENT

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

YES

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

Yes.

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?

YES

Q 10 Are the keywords appropriate?

YES

Q 11 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

YES

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:

Minor revisions.