Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases
Volume 19 · Issue 1 · e142157

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Short-term Safety of Covaxin, Sinopharm, Sputnik V, and AstraZeneca COVID-19 Vaccines Among Iranian Healthcare Workers: A Cross-sectional Study

Reza Sinaei, Mohammad Javad Najafzadeh, Somayeh Ghafari, Ali Hosseininasab, Abbas Pardakhty, Behnam Dalfardi, Maysam Yousefi, Ali Sinaei, Sara Pezeshki, Roya Sinaei, Azam Dehghani, Fatemeh Karami Robati, Mehrnoush Hassas Yeganeh, Faranak Salajegheh, Fatemeh Goharriz

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
29 Oct 2023	19 Dec 2023	22 Dec 2023	10.5812/archcid-142157

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Referee 2 2
2 **Revision 1** 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 7

1 Original submission

2 comments · 5 Nov 2023 – 5 Nov 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 5 Nov 2023

Dear author:
I gladly review “Short-term safety of Covaxin, Sinopharm, Sputnik V and Asterazeneka COVID-19 Vaccines among Iranian healthcare workers: A cross-sectional study;;”
My opinion is below:

- Authors should provide a comparative table for all reported articles related to vaccine side effects to date (with a clear search strategy in PubMed, Scopus, Medline, etc.) that includes year of report/country, age, sex, clinical presentation, interval between vaccination and side effects, and outcome.
- The manuscript needs major English editing.
"My opinion is on major revision"

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 5 Nov 2023

Dear authors,
I appreciate the time and effort you devoted to this study. The topic is novel, interesting, and within the scope of the journal. However, I have some concerns that should be resolved before the manuscript can be considered for publication. Please address my comments:
Title and abstract
1-Please substitute “prospective cross-sectional study” with “cross-sectional study”. This change should also be applied to the main text. The time of the study and the data collection instrument should be added to the method section.
Introduction
2-The study hypothesis is well explained, which is appreciated. Please update the data related to the 2nd reference.
3-“COVID-19 infection” is scientifically incorrect. Please substitute it with “SARS-CoV-2” and “COVID-19”. Please apply this change throughout the text.
Method
4-Was data collection based on the census method or sampling? If it was based on sampling, please describe how the sample size was estimated and specify the sampling method. If not, please mention that it was based on the census method.
5-Please mention the organ-specific symptoms in detail in the method section. Which gastrointestinal, musculoskeletal, respiratory, and other symptoms were investigated in your study?
Discussion
6-The discussion section should be expanded. There are some studies comparing the prevalence of post-vaccination side effects between the first and second doses of the vaccines. Please use them to improve the discussion section.
Babamahmoodi F, Saeedi M, Alizadeh-Navaei R, Hedayatizadeh-Omran A, Mousavi SA, Ovaise G, et al. Side effects and Immunogenicity following administration of the Sputnik V COVID-19 vaccine in health care workers in Iran. Scientific reports. 2021;11(1):21464.

Yadegarynia D, Tehrani S, Hadavand F, Arshi S, Abtahian Z, Keyvanfar A, et al. Side Effects of COVID-19 Vaccination Among Healthcare Workers in Tehran, Iran. International Journal of Medical Toxicology and

Forensic Medicine. 2023; 13(3):E40536. https://doi.org/10.32598/ijmtfm.v13i3.40536

Language
7- The manuscript is poorly written in English. I strongly recommend having it edited by an English editor to improve grammar, punctuation, fluency, and general style.
Best regards

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear editor,
Thank you for reviewing our article.
We considered all comments of the reviewers point to point and marked them in one copy.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Dear authors,
I appreciate your time and effort involved in this study. The topic is novel, interesting, and within the scope of the journal. However, I have some concerns that should be resolved before considering for publication. Please address my comments:
Title and abstract
1-Please substitute “prospective cross-sectional study” with “cross-sectional study”. It should also be applied to the main text. Time of the study and data collection instrument should be added to the method section.
Response: The phrase "prospective cross-sectional study" has been replaced with "cross-sectional study" in the title, abstract, and main text. In addition, the time period of the study, from April 2021 to March 2022, and the data collection instrument, an organized questionnaire, were added to the method section.

Introduction
2-The study hypothesis is well explained, which is appreciated. Please update the data related to the 2nd reference.
Response: The data related to the 2nd reference has been updated as requested by the reviewer.

3-“COVID-19 infection” is scientifically incorrect. Please substitute it with “SARS-CoV-2” and “COVID-19”. Please apply it throughout the text.
Response: It was revised.

Method
4-Was data collection based on census method or sampling? If it was based on sampling, please add how to estimate sample size and sampling method. If not, please mention it was based on the census method.
Response: Data collection was based on census method.

5-Please, mention the organ-specific symptoms in detail in the method section. Which gastrointestinal, musculoskeletal, respiratory, … symptoms were investigated in your study?
Response: The organ-specific symptoms were mentioned in detail in the method section.

Discussion
6-The discussion section should be expanded. There are some studies comparing the prevalence of post-vaccination side effects between the first and second doses of the vaccines. Please use them to improve the discussion section.
Babamahmoodi F, Saeedi M, Alizadeh-Navaei R, Hedayatizadeh-Omran A, Mousavi SA, Ovaise G, et al. Side effects and Immunogenicity following administration of the Sputnik V COVID-19 vaccine in health care workers in Iran. Scientific reports. 2021;11(1):21464.

Yadegarynia D, Tehrani S, Hadavand F, Arshi S, Abtahian Z, Keyvanfar A, et al. Side Effects of COVID-19 Vaccination Among Healthcare Workers in Tehran, Iran. International Journal of Medical Toxicology and Forensic Medicine. 2023; 13(3):E40536. https://doi.org/10.32598/ijmtfm.v13i3.40536
Response: It was revised.

Language
7- The manuscript is poorly written in English. I strongly recommend editing it by an English editor to improve grammar, punctuation, fluency, and general style.
Response: It was revised.

Best regards

Reviewer 2:
Dear author:
I gladly review “Short-term safety of Covaxin, Sinopharm, Sputnik V and Asterazeneka COVID-19 Vaccines among Iranian healthcare workers: A cross-sectional study;;”
My opinion is below:

-Authors should provide a comparative table for all reported articles related vaccine side effects till now (with clear search strategy in PubMed, Scopus, Medline and etc.) that includes year of report/country, age, sex, clinical presentation, interval between vaccine and side effects, and outcome.

Response: Table 7, titled "Summary of Studies on COVID-19 Vaccines' Side Effects Included in This Study", has been added as requested by the reviewer.

-The manuscript needs major English edition
"My opinion is on major revision"

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Major revision

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.