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Reviewer's report:

General

Not easy to write a paper with this kind of review; The methods is very clear but results and discussion are not so easy to read. Unfortunatly, I don’t have any brillant suggestion to give apart avoiding the list of countries when they are more than 10 and trying to be more synthetic when you can !

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

- As most of the countries has established priority group, it should be better to give the name of the 4 countries that did not to make the reading easier (page 8)
- Same comment for rationales for priorization (page 11)
- "HCW as vaccine priority group" said twice on page 9 : try to synthetise the 2 first paragraph of the page 9
- Fergusson and German assume the start of the vaccination 2 months after the begining of the pandemic. Longini assumes that it starts before!! It does not suit with what is expecting with the vaccine production and I think that you should moderate your conclusion regarding children vaccination, even if I really think that MOH should have a better look on the modelling studies’ results.
- Which association were you expecting from population size and priority groups : as there is no information on the vaccine orders or availability, do you really think that a country may know how many people they will be able to vaccine ?
- It should help to better clarify your key message : acceptability, feasibility, updating the prioritization according to the new knowledge (including modelling) and flexibility (because a lot of uncertainty). You have 10 sentences on the first message, 5 on the second, 1 and 3 on the 3rd and 4th one when I think that they are much more equally important

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.