PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 76888

Title: Prevention and management of adverse events following COVID-19 vaccination using traditional Korean Medicine: An Online Survey of Public Health Doctors

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00724887

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Director

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-07 13:39

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-17 05:07

Review time: 9 Days and 15 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is well written review highlighting attitudes and perceptions toward the prevention and management of adverse events following COVID-19 vaccination using traditional Korean Medicine The language is okay I have few comments I request the authors to share what ingredients are used to make these herbal medicines What are the side effects of these herbal medication

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 76888

Title: Prevention and management of adverse events following COVID-19 vaccination using traditional Korean Medicine: An Online Survey of Public Health Doctors

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05213310

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Full Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-09 02:08

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-09 02:15

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

| **Peer-reviewer statements** | Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous   [   ] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Please make the following changes: 1. Rewrite the manuscript's title. 2. Try to include the main numerical values in the abstract's result section. 3. Summarize the manuscript's background section with additional recent references. 4. The methodology section is well written and requires no further revision. 5. Take the subtitles out of the result section. 6. The limitation, recommendation, and future prospects must be added to the discussion section of the manuscript. 7. Try to elaborate your conclusion. 8. Some typos were discovered while reviewing. Thank you very much.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [Y] Rejection

Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors: I have now reviewed your paper and recognize your manuscript addresses the interesting research question. However, I can suggest several weaknesses in the manuscript.   *Method and design. * Structural problem There are some problems in your manuscript.   Abstract 1.   Abstract did not followed a logic and proper structured way. I suggest use a structured abstract to enhanced organized concepts.   2.   Abstract is not informative.   Introduction   3.The aim and objective is not clear.   4.The study need more explanation for rationalization.. I found the structure of the manuscript difficult the follow, somehow disorganized and scattered. Therefore, I suggest that the author(s) be very precise and simple on what they wanted to say/what they aimed.   5. Analytical strategy is ambiguous. 6.   Priori power analysis, which is highly suggested in research was missed.   Results   7.   There is a series of ambiguity related report frequency or percentage. All frequencies must be written as (n=   ). I suggest reports the descriptive as below: 58.1% (n= 36). Also, the report of t test and F test are not standards. 8.   Report three decimal places for p-values consistently.   9. Leave scale names (abbreviations) out of all sections except the measurement section. Report the concept(s) you are measuring. The exception to this rule is if you are specifically studying the properties of the scale in question rather than the concept(s) it measures.   10.   Do not report the percentage without frequency   11.   Put a leading zero for indices that can take values greater than plus 1 or lower than minus 1 such as means, standard deviations, b, beta, and standard error. 12.   Do not put a leading zero for indices such as r, alpha, and p. However, journal rules may vary from this but they

will then edit and change to their own liking. 13. Report two decimal places in general but three for p values and one for percentage values 14. The 95% CI must be added next go P values. 15. The analysis procedure are not clear. Discussion 16. There are similar aspects that need to be addressed as in the Introduction 17. Furthermore, the manuscript would benefit from a further explanation of new intervention or possible related findings.