

Review of: "Acceptance of Childhood Rotavirus Vaccine Among Mothers at The Point of Rotavirus Vaccine Introduction: A case study from Awka Anambra State Nigeria"

Habib O. Ramadhani¹

¹ University of Maryland, Baltimore

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript describes various aspects of rotavirus vaccine, including respondents' knowledge, acceptance, usefulness, and safety.

Comments:

1. I don't see the significance of presenting odds ratios and their associated 95% CI at 3 decimal places. One decimal should be enough.
2. Under the heading "sample size calculation," the statement "The number of samples [217] was.." needs to be revised. The word "samples" is like referring to blood/urine samples when in fact it was meant to reflect sample size.
3. Data analysis.
 - a. Please change "multivariate" to "multivariable."
 - b.Fisher exact, as appropriate... (Delete 'or')
 - c. Adjusted odds ratio... (Change to odds ratio)
 - d. ...95% CI were analysed...(Change to "computed" or "calculated" as opposed to "analyzed" because we analyze data but calculate effect sizes such as OR, RR, IR, etc.)
 - e. How did you handle missing data in your multivariable regression models?
4. Results
 - a. I would not use "majority" if referring to 39% of people.
 - b. ...97.2% have Christianity as their religion. (Would probably say "were Christians" instead of "have Christianity as religion.")
 - c. How do you explain that having a high income is associated with lower knowledge?
5. Table 3. The part that had maternal beliefs may be confusing to readers. I recommend creating a separate table for these 3 items, such that you have, for example, "acceptance of rotavirus vaccine because it is safe (yes/no)" and a p-value. Do the same for other items. Alternatively, you may consider creating a composite endpoint for the two items (safety and usefulness to children) and run regression models like you did for knowledge.

6. I am having difficulties understanding figure 1. If there is a simple way to communicate this, please do.

7. Discussion

- a. I would summarize the main findings in the first paragraph before starting to make comparisons with other studies.
- b. Multiple areas I see child(ren). I get it, you want to attribute singular and plural, just use "children" even if the mother had one child for simplicity.
- c. is the major cause of U5 AGE. (What does U5 AGE mean? You better state "under five" than using U5. Regardless, the whole sentence is not clear.)
- d. ... rotavirus and the AGE caused by it,.... (It is not clear, every time I came across this capitalized "AGE" statement, what information is being conveyed. These areas need to be revised.)
- e. 84% by Ullah et al., poor knowledge of the virus in Peshawar, Pakistan. (Really difficult to follow the flow of ideas at this part of the sentence here.)
- f. Regarding socioeconomic factors associated with willingness.....(Factors listed afterwards were sociodemographic, please take note and make changes). As I proposed earlier, it will be more informative if you create a composite endpoint for the two items and do a regression model. The p-values from the chi-square test do not let us know the referent group, especially when you have a variable with more than 2 categories.
- g. I think the manuscript will benefit from an English editing, particularly the discussion part. Some areas are difficult to follow.

8. Limitations

- a. The expectations are to state both limitations and strengths of the study. Not only listing them, but describing them and why you think those limitations do not make your study less valuable.
- b. The x-sectional nature makes the relation associational but not causal (limitation).
- c. What strengths does the study have?