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Dear Editor, we would like to share ideas on the publication "Bibliometric and visual analysis of vaccination hesitancy research from 2013 to 2022." Vaccination hesitancy, defined as the delay or refusal of vaccination despite the availability of vaccination services, is an important topic of research in public health. By undertaking a bibliometric analysis, this study seeks to provide a thorough picture of vaccination hesitancy research from 2013 to 2022. All connected publications were found using the Web of Science Core Collection Database. Bibliometric analyses can be useful for assessing trends, patterns, and the influence of research in a specific topic. This work can help to our understanding of the research environment regarding vaccination hesitancy across the chosen time period by completing such an analysis. By doing such an analysis, this study can help to our understanding of the research environment regarding vaccination hesitancy across the chosen time period. The investigation may identify major themes, influential authors, collaborations, and citation patterns, among other factors, by examining the retrieved papers. This data can be used to identify research gaps, highlight areas of attention, and influence future studies and actions focused at overcoming vaccination reluctance.

The dependence on a single database, the Web of Science Core Collection, for obtaining literature linked to vaccination reluctance could be a major weakness of this investigation. While the Web of Science is a respected and frequently used database, reliance on a single database could introduce bias and limit the analysis’s comprehensiveness. Furthermore, the study’s focus on the years 2013 to 2022 may present a temporal restriction. Vaccination reluctance is a dynamic field, with key advancements and research occurring before 2013 or after 2022. As a result, the findings may not accurately reflect the current level of research on vaccine reluctance. It is also worth noting that bibliometric analyses primarily provide quantitative insights into publication trends. Furthermore, bibliometric analyses primarily provide quantitative insights into publishing trends, authorship patterns, and citation metrics. They can be useful for mapping the research environment, but they may not provide detailed insights into the content and quality of the publications themselves. To gain a more comprehensive knowledge of vaccination hesitancy studies, it would be desirable to combine the bibliometric analysis with a thorough qualitative examination of the included papers. Given these potential constraints, it is critical that the authors and readers evaluate the study’s findings while keeping in mind the study’s scope, potential biases, and the need for a broader review of the topic outside the selected time frame and database.

Concerns are raised every time a new vaccination is created and made available to the public. Concerns are raised every time a new COVID-19 vaccination is created and made available to the public. Because of the erratic character of the hesitant pattern throughout time, the effect of promotion at different times may vary. Additional study, if necessary, should focus on identifying and resolving the fundamental causes of vaccination resistance, such as erroneous information, mistrust, and access barriers, as well as developing and assessing practical solutions to vaccine hesitancy in various circumstances.
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