

# Review of: "Determinant of Vaccination Status among Children Under Five years in Mattu Town, Oromia Regional State, Ethiopia"

Md. Salauddin Khan<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Khulna University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Child vaccination status is a very significant subject of investigation. This study will provide valuable insights into the particular region of Ethiopia. However, there are some inquiries about the procedure of analysis.

1. The first inquiry pertains to the process of **determining the sample size**. The researchers determined that the margin of error is 0.09. Given that this research is focused on a particular location and involves a large number of individuals, it would be more appropriate to choose a significance level of 0.05 instead of 0.09. Subsequently, the sample size will be sufficiently big. The sample size is at 118, which is considered quite tiny.
2. Is the value of p (**the percentage of children that are completely vaccinated**) measured empirically or assumed? The information is ambiguous. It is preferable to ascertain via a pilot survey. The value of p, representing the proportion of children who have had full vaccination, does not align with the reported vaccination status percentages (57.6% and 42.4%) or the findings from the literature review. Multiple researchers have reported different findings about the efficacy of vaccines. Various illnesses had vaccination rates of 24%, 46%, 56%, and 66% respectively. I believe that the use of p is unsuitable in this context.
3. WHO provides a range of vaccinations for different illnesses to children under the age of 5. However, let us focus just on three immunizations. **The title** references the vaccination status, however it lacks reliability.
4. The research variable lacks clarity since it merely specifies whether individuals were vaccinated or not. It is important to note the extent to which illnesses were taken into account and the criteria used to determine the vaccine's efficacy. Assume they **examined three illnesses**. Two vaccinations have been completed for two illnesses, but one vaccine remains incomplete for the specified diseases. How was this situation managed? The information is ambiguous. It requires further specificity and a greater level of detail.
5. The writing is generally proficient and the premise is satisfactory.