

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

Olufunmilola O. Abolurin

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

General comments:

- The research gives good information about the acceptability of the rotavirus vaccine; however, several aspects of the manuscript require revision.
- Several typographical errors were noted throughout the manuscript, e.g., past vs. present tense, plural vs. singular. The authors can consider using an online writing tool that provides grammar and spelling checks, such as Grammarly, to easily identify and correct these errors.
- Inconsistency with authors' names – one of the names has a title (Dr), while others have no title.

Abstract:

- Methods: The methods section is too scanty and is uninformative about how the study was carried out, whereas a lot of unnecessary information was included in the background. This should be addressed.
- Results: "50% of respondents had given their children the rotavirus vaccine" – Do you mean any of their children? Furthermore, 'given' is not an appropriate word here since the respondents were not the ones who administered the vaccine.
- "Women who had tertiary education were to have knowledge of rotavirus" Is it knowledge of the virus itself, the disease it causes, or the vaccine?
- "With the Medical Doctor having the highest confidence in the doctor to provide information" – What do the authors mean by this?

Introduction:

- "Countries with low socio-economic status" is not a correct expression. Do you mean low-income countries?

Methods:

- What is meant by "child bearing mothers"? Is it mothers who have young children or women of childbearing age? These are different. Which one was considered?
- The study population was not well defined. Antenatal clinics were mentioned as sites of recruitment; some ANC

attendees (especially primigravidas) may not have children. Were they included? It is not clear whether all available women were recruited or only those with young children.

- Which of the formulae by Lwanga et al was used for sample size calculation?
- Data tool: Please rephrase “Information in the questionnaire collected include....”
- Wrong in-text citation: “Ibadin and George [13]” – The second author’s surname is not George.
- Socioeconomic status: The middle-income class was defined as earning ₦100,000 or less per month. This definition also captures the category earlier defined as low-income. Hence, the lower limit should be stated for the middle-class category.
- Data analysis: Authors stated that “Tests of association between selected variables and respondents' variables were done....” What does this mean? What selected variables did not belong to the respondents?
- Odds ratio was written as odd ration.
- “.... were analyzed to identify risk factors associated with knowledge of rotavirus disease”. Can risk factors be associated with knowledge? Please rephrase.

Results:

- What is meant by mother’s index child?
- “had between 2 to 3 children” – since there’s no half child, this should be written as ‘had two or three children’. Please note that numbers less than 10 should preferably be written in words.
- Table 1: the expression “up2date” is not appropriate.
- Knowledge of Rotavirus among the respondents: This section started with “Of the 166 (76.5%) respondents that had knowledge of rotavirus” whereas the proportion that had the knowledge had not been previously mentioned. This should be addressed by first stating the proportion that had the knowledge before making further analysis on them.
- Table 3 is too large and its interpretation in the prose is also confusing. It seems the authors were mistaking bivariate analysis for multivariate analysis or they are claiming to have done multivariate analysis without bivariate analysis. Results of bivariate analysis should be clearly presented before going to multivariate analysis (which is usually restricted only to variables that are significantly associated with the outcome variable on bivariate analysis).
- The information depicted in Figure 1 is not clear. Authors should consider removing the figure and discussing the information in prose.
- “the mean score for those that responded that they would prefer to get information about vaccines from a medical doctor was 5” – this statement is not clear. Why not report the proportion who chose that option? Were multiple responses allowed in that section? This aspect needs clarification.
- Conflicting results: Results for the number/proportion who were fully immunized and those who were up to date with their immunization were repeated in the same paragraph and surprisingly, two different figures were given – 8/214 & 8/124 for under-immunized; 60/214 and 121/214 for up to date. ???Typo errors. Repetition should be avoided, and conflicting results should be reconciled.
- Is the designation “up to date” a generally acceptable terminology? Adequately/fully immunized for age is a more familiar term. Please consider this.

- What does “outside the recommended age window” mean? Does it mean that the children were not up to the age when the vaccine should be given or they were older than that age, or both?

Discussion

- The abbreviation U5 wasn't defined anywhere, and it wasn't even previously used where it could have applied in the earlier part of the manuscript.
- Stating that 84% awareness found in this study agrees with the 61.6% found in an earlier study is inappropriate and may be misleading. These two figures are quite far apart.
- What does halal status in Indonesia mean/entail?
- It may not be appropriate to ask rhetorical questions such as “it means it is not important, right?” in the Discussion. This can be more appropriately expressed, e.g., it may mean that.... (added comma after "expressed" and changed "rhetoric" to "rhetorical")
- Did both the Italian and Canadian studies find exactly the same 95.2% of parents being informed of vaccination by their doctors? That is the impression being given here. Please address this.
- The statement: “half of the parents (Father and mother) who participated in this study jointly take decisions on matters concerning their children RI” is incorrect and confusing. It should be rephrased. Fathers did not participate in this study.
- “This can also be explained further by 49.8% of the index child(ren) that....” – This inference is incorrect as the finding being referred to cannot explain this point.

Limitations:

- Not sighting the immunization cards is a major limitation that could be a major confounder to the study findings.

References:

- Some of the references were not properly formatted, e.g., the group/association that the authors did the work for in Ref 1 and 5 was taken as a separate additional author; journal name was duplicated in Ref 8. The references should be revised appropriately, and authors should ensure that the pattern aligns with the journal's requirements.