

# Review of: "Acceptance of COVID-19 vaccination at different hypothetical efficacy and safety levels in Nigeria."

Joseph Wilson

**Potential competing interests:** The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

Great effort by the research. However, there are a few observations that could help the research improve on future research

(1) Justification as to why the researcher studied the Acceptance of COVID-19 vaccination at different hypothetical efficacy and safety levels in Nigeria is not articulative enough. The conceptualization of the research problem or gap needs to be properly articulated, so that readers would see the significance of the study or why the study was necessary. The answer of what necessitated the study needs to clearly captured and convincing.

(2).What is or are the specific objective(s) of the study? The aim of the work was to assess the acceptance rate of COVID-19 vaccination at different hypothetical efficacy and safety levels in Nigeria, what specifically the researcher assessed and against what backdrop in the context of Nigeria were not captured in the background

(3). The perspective introduced in the second paragraph of the methodology that introduced a new word **FICTITIOUS** raises question about how that word affects the focus as reflected in the title of the

(4).How would the researcher reconcile the main objective of the paper and the response variable?

"This study assessed the acceptance rate of COVID-19 vaccination at different hypothetical efficacy and safety levels in Nigeria"

"Nigerians' perceptions of **fictitious** COVID-19 immunizations with varying degrees of efficiency and safety"

(5).The questions raised in the paragraph 3, 4 and 5 in the methodology section do not have justification, not even in the background of the work, which should have provided a clear and concise reasons for asking them. For example what is the relevance of the question below in respect of acceptance of COVID 19 vaccine?

Some of the question

"How much your work changed as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic?" and "How much your salary changed as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic?" (1) "Social distancing can protect your child or children from COVID-19 (if any)"; (2) "Social distancing can protect your parents from COVID-19"; and (3) "Social distancing can protect you from COVID-19"

How do these questions relate to COVID 19 acceptance?

(6).There is no explanation on sampling technique(s) and justification for use. No justification for the sample size and how reliable and suitable is the method of data collection to be accepted as a study that reflects the perception of Nigerian?

(7) The finding would have been better understood if the author had done a proper conceptualization of the research problem and an articulate background as well as clearly identified objectives. It is had to relate to the findings without these fundamental components that make research more clearer. Sure, there are findings, but how do readers appreciate

the finding against the backdrop of the supposed focus of the title?

Author needs to note these fundamentals in future works, to give the work a more acceptable standard.