

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

Anggraini Alam¹

¹ Universitas Padjadjaran

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The aim of this study was beneficial. However, there are some parts that need to be fixed in the manuscript.

Although this study has already shown its reasons for being conducted in its entirety, readers have not yet been able to see how important this study is to be done in the city of Mattu itself. Is Mattu town the city with the highest number of deaths from diseases that can be prevented with immunization, or is it a city with a low level of immunization coverage? The reasons for the choice of the city of Mattu as a place of research should be mentioned, both in the abstract and in the introduction section.

In the study population of the method section, the author mentioned "parents of children aged between 1-5 years," but in the inclusion and exclusion criteria, the author mentioned the inclusion criteria as children aged five and fewer years. Please provide more detail in outlining the inclusion and exclusion criteria, as it is important for consistency throughout the study and writing in the manuscript.

The inclusion and exclusion criteria could be explored more. For example, are children under five years of age who have congenital diseases or immunocompromised children and cannot be immunized for some vaccines still included in the inclusion criteria? Furthermore, is a child under one year of age that has not met their time for certain immunizations included as a sample? This also leads to the need for an explanation of at what age the child is said to be fully immunized and what the term "fully immunized children" in your area means. On the other hand, while the method to determine the size of the sample has been shown, the sampling technique used has not been explained.

In the results section, it is necessary to include a detailed description of the age range for the pediatric sample. This should include highlighting the most frequently observed age, using either the median or mean depending on the distribution of the data. Apart from that, in my opinion, it would be better if the data presented in Table 1 were separated into complete and incomplete vaccination, along with frequency and percentage. This could make it easier for readers to conclude and compare the frequency of each variable between the two groups.

For the discussion, there should be a written explanation of why the study is important and strengthened by other supporting research. The "different region," as mentioned by the author to be consistent with the study, should be mentioned in detail. Furthermore, the discussion section is very brief and written similar to the results section, when it



should be thorough and provide sufficient corroborating evidence for the results of this study. The implications of the study findings on policy and how useful the findings are in enhancing childhood vaccination coverage should also be explained to further strengthen the study.