

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_85428
Title of the Manuscript:	COVID-19 vaccine uptake and its determinants among adult population in Somali region of Ethiopia.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript entitled “COVID-19 vaccine uptake and its determinants among adult population in Somali region of Ethiopia” falls within the scope of Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research. However, it needs a major revision before it can be accepted.</p> <p>Introduction: The literature review does not find the gaps in the current research and hence it is difficult to see the innovations made in this study. What is the significance/practical implication of this study?</p> <p>Method: There is insufficient information on the data quality and data preparation. Specify the exact data collection duration and time. It is not clear that how the authors selected variables for the multiple logistic regression. I mean need to specify how independent variables are entered into the multiple logistic regression. The degree of correlation between the predictor variables and outcome variables or FORWARD/ BACKWARD/STEPWISE variable selection approach can be used (Please see http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-045506 and https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.31.22270172) .</p> <p>Results: Results are well described. However, writing quality is very poor. In Figure 1, one option is missing (5 bars but only 4 options). What does (χ^2 67.776, p<0.05) mean? The number of decimal values is not consistent for test statistics and p-values.</p> <p>Discussion: Compare your results with similar studies done internationally (e.g. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0257096) .</p>	<p>Introduction: Statements on the Practical implication of the study included</p> <p>Methods: duration of data collection included and how the independent variables(socio demographic profiles) are entered into the multiple logistic regression modelling included.</p> <p>Results: Bar char corrected. Consistency in the decimal values for test statistic and p values done</p> <p>Discussion: other international studies included in the results</p>
Minor REVISION comments	Writing needs improvement, at many locations, the writing is poor.	Done
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	