

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

Agustina Setyaningsih¹

¹ Universitas Indonesia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. Why choose NSB, even though the research was done in Gambia? It needs a justification why the research was done in NSB as a representative from Gambia.
2. How to physically and mentally filter that did it. Researchers need some inclusion criteria, such as filtering methods, that are based on certain observations and examinations.
3. Researchers and team need to explain about the deadline, especially for non-residents.
4. Based on the article: "Third, at the household level, two respondents were selected using a simple random sampling method for interviews. In households with more than two eligible respondents, the simple random sampling method is used to select respondents". That statement still needs a study reference, and the researchers also need to choose a numerator and explain how the researchers implemented a technically standard?
5. The researchers have to explain more about category "yes," especially for respondents who were included in that sample, have received how many vaccines in a year and what year.
6. Using with p-value ≤ 0.15 needs references as well.
7. The research sampling is included, how a 504 sample size is obtained.
8. Figure 2 explains whether the vaccine recipients, but there is no education level variable, even though it is explained in the abstract, whereas in tables 1 and 2 it is not mentioned.
10. Table 2 has to be equipped with OR, not just customized OR, so that changes in the variables involved can be seen at the analysis stage.
11. In the discussion, it is necessary to add a percentage target for herd immunity.
12. In the first paragraph of the discussion section, why do the younger generation receive more vaccines or have a higher prevalence compared to other age groups? The researchers need to explain the valid reason.
13. In Table 2, about married status, the reference category for which isn't mentioned, and also in the discussion section, about the widowed status, is not available in the table.

14. More than half of Covid-19 vaccination recipients are married, and around a quarter of recipients are single. Therefore, "married respondents are 72% more likely to receive Covid-19 vaccination, and single respondents are 88% more likely to receive vaccination against widows", therefore, those statements need to get more additional analysis.
15. Education level was found to be a factor associated with Covid-19 vaccination among respondents. The majority of those who received vaccinations were respondents who did not receive formal education is not discussed.
16. Research findings also reveal a relationship between respondents' monthly income and receipt of Covid-19 vaccination. "Respondents whose average monthly income was less than D1000 (\$20), D5000 (\$100), and D10,000 (\$200) were 74%, 87%, and 90% less likely to receive Covid-19 vaccination than those with the same income, more than D10,000 (\$200)," which is also not available in tables 1 and 2.
17. In table 2, ethnicity and religion are not discussed in the discussion.
18. Gender, ethnicity, education level, monthly income, smoking, Covid-19 test, and travel history outside the area—why also aren't discussed in the analysis in the conclusion.