

Review of: "Covid-19 vaccine uptake and its associated factors among rural households in The Gambia: a community-based cross-sectional study"

Khairul Hafidz Alkhair bin Khairul Amin Khairul Hafidz Alkhair

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Title

- Title adequate

Abstract

- In result, vaccine hesitancy is not included, which is the main issue the authors want to make when reading the whole article.
- Recommendation should be changed to other recommendation.

Introduction:

- The authors write about the challenges of vaccination uptake in paragraphs two, three, and four. Should be There is only one specific paragraph to mention vaccination hesitancy. Suggestion to put it all about vaccination challenges and hesitancy in the fourth paragraph only.
- The statement "Evidence revealed that less than half of the global population had received at least a single dose of Covid-19 vaccines; more than 721 million doses of vaccine were administered, with nearly 32 million doses administered daily; and nearly 2 percent of people in low-income countries have received at least one dose of Covid-19" does not glue with the previous and the next statement. Suggest this to be removed. Or it can be reworded and put in the first paragraph.

Methodology

- Study design is mentioned.
- In the exclusion criteria, it is quite confusing when the authors say to exclude seriously ill persons (chronically ill persons). Is it seriously ill or chronically ill? These two are different. Chronically ill persons don't mean they are seriously ill. Suggest to reword this.
- Please put the reference for the Cochran formula.
- Sampling procedure is clear.
- There is also a school of thought where variables with p-value ≤ 0.25 can be included in the logistic regression. Please put the reference for your statement.

Result

- Socio-demographic characteristics are adequate.
- It is not clear how the data were collected from the respondents who do not take the Covid-19 vaccination. Is there a checklist or do the respondents need to state their reasons in the questionnaire? This needs to be explained further in the methodology.
- The factors associated do not include vaccine hesitancy. Is there any reason for it?
- The wording “[a OR], is it AOR? If not, suggest to remove the “a”
- In table 2, at Gender, Female as Ref, do not put “1.”

Discussion

- The first paragraph addresses vaccine hesitancy, but vaccine hesitancy is not included as a factor associated with vaccination uptake in Table 2. Vaccine hesitancy is only mentioned in the descriptive analysis, not in the factors associated (multiple logistic regression).
- The second paragraph does not put forward any possible reasons why vaccine uptake decreases with age. The authors had put reasons in the third paragraph for gender, but not in the second paragraph. What is the possible reason for the reduced uptake with the reduced age?
- “The acceptance of vaccination may be associated with regulations regarding vaccination status being a requirement in some public offices and schools.” – please provide a reference for this statement.
- For the fifth paragraph, what is the possible reason the vaccination rate reduces with an increase in monthly income? Please state the possible reason and then provide a reference.
- The sixth paragraph, even though the statement is true, why were these variables not included in the multiple logistic regression? Is there any reason they only stop at the descriptive analysis?
- No explanation of cigarette smoking is provided, even though cigarette smoking is also one of the significant variables.

Strengths and limitations.

- Only one limitation is mentioned by the authors. Are there no other limitations for this study?

Conclusion.

- The recommendation that text messaging is not been tested in this study, and this recommendation should not be one of the recommendations.

Overall

- Overall, there is confusion apparent when reading this study. While it initially appears that the authors aim to concentrate on vaccine hesitancy, the study's results do not align with this focus.
- Vaccine hesitancy is only addressed in the descriptive analysis, and notably, it is not included in the logistic regression presented in Table 2.

- It is suggested that the introduction be rearranged to shift the focus away from vaccine hesitancy and towards the main focus of the study, which is the factors associated with vaccination.
- Regarding recommendations, proposing the use of text messaging does not align with the study's scope, as text messaging was not assessed or included in the study's methodology.