Reviewer's report

Title: Uptake of Intermittent Preventive Treatment for Malaria during Pregnancy with Sulphadoxine-Pyrimethamine (IPTp-SP) among Postpartum Women in Zomba District, Malawi: A Cross-Sectional Study

Version: 0 Date: 06 Feb 2018

Reviewer: Oyelola Adegboye

Reviewer's report:

The authors of this manuscript have conducted a study to assess the uptake of IPTp-SP uptake in Zomba region of Zambia and identified associated risk factors for low uptake of IPTp-SP. They should be commended for conducting such a very important public health issue.

However, I have the following comments:

Background:

Line 16-20: approx 11% (100,000)… this percent refers to what population? Worldwide?

Study design:

Line 20-31: Provide a reference for the claim "Zomba as one of the district with lowest IPTp uptake in Malawi?"

Data Analysis:

Line 32-40: At some point in the results section/abstract the authors used 95% CI for proportions, how were these calculated? Based on what? mention this in the methods section.

Results:

Line 24-34: Insert % in the 95% CI limits. For example…127 (29.8%, 95% CI: 25.6%-34.3%).
Cultural characteristics:

What do you mean by women who had problems with spouses' escort to ANC? This was not mentioned or defined in the list of explanatory variables. Perhaps a descriptive summary table consisting of the list of variables considered in this study would be helpful.

Individual characteristics:

Primigravida/multigravida…please define these terms as footnotes of table 3.

Determinant of uptake of IPTp-SP

Line 17-60 and Line1-7

Please indicate this subsection as …"Univariate analysis"

The reader is left wondering which of the tables the authors are interpreting at this stage. No reference was made to any of the tables. Also, "12 out of the 21 variables"…please provide a table with a full list of the variables and their associated p-values and 95% CI.

Line 10-45: Please indicate this subsection as …"Multivariable analysis"

Assessment of goodness of fit of the model

Line 16: .. chi-square of 220 of freedom …use the word "degrees"

Discussion

Paragraph 2, Line 58: ..To the knowledge of the authors..

Revised as "To the best knowledge of the authors…"

Line 3-10… This observation might either indicate that pregnant women in rural areas made fewer ANC visits than urban women or rural health facility had lower stock levels of SP than urban health facility...
This statement could be verified via interaction term in a multivariable logistic model that includes "place of residence", "number of ANC visits" and "their interaction term". This will answer the question "whether IPTp uptake varies depending rural/urban and number of ANC visits".

Conclusion

Line 8: this study was conducted for to…remove "for"

The manuscript would benefit from language edits for orthographic and grammatical errors.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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