

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

Opeoluwa Oyedele

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. The objective of this study is relevant in its field, and the paper, presented in its current form, is fairly good. Below are some comments for consideration in the betterment of this paper:

1. Abstract: "In Africa, Nigeria has one of the highest under 5 years rotavirus disease prevalence of 56%, and mortality due to rotavirus accounted for an estimated 31,000 deaths in 2013." What is the latest statistic for 2023/2024, especially when there is at least a 10-year gap between 2013 and the study period of this current study? Also, it should be $p < 0.001$ and NOT $p = < 0.001$.
2. No conclusion statement in the Abstract. Why?
3. Introduction: A brief background information on rotaviruses in sub-Saharan Africa, especially in Nigeria, should be added before the Rotavirus vaccines information paragraph.
4. What is the current situation of rotavirus vaccination in sub-Saharan Africa, especially in Nigeria? This needs to be added after mentioning the situation in Canada & the US.
5. A stronger justification for embarking on this study is still needed. Also, is there a conceptual framework?
6. Sample size calculation: It should be $(n=217)$ and not $[217]$.
7. Data tool and data collection: "A structured and validated questionnaire was used as a tool to collect data from participants." Validated by whom, and how?
8. Where can the structured and validated questionnaire used in this study be found?
9. Determinants of socio-economic status of participants: It should read "... per month, with one US dollar equivalent to 876 Naira (as of 24 July 2023). Educational level ..."
10. Knowledge of Rotavirus among the respondents: All p-values with < 0.001 should be written as such in their respective result interpretation, that is $p < 0.001$ and NOT $p = < 0.001$.
11. How was "good knowledge of rotavirus infection" quantified? That is, what was used to measure if knowledge of

rotavirus infection was good or bad? Please clarify.

12. Where are the p-values for the mothers whose average monthly income was higher(>N120,000) (aOR = 0.106, 95% CI =0.107 – 0.937) and those classified as having higher socioeconomic status (aOR =0.366, 95% CI 0.134 – 0.995)?

13. Attitude towards Vaccines Generally: Figure 1 needs to be explained properly, especially when the type of display form used is not easily understandable to the eyes.

14. English language correction is needed, with careful grammar checking and proofreading.

15. Where is the Recommendation section of the paper?