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REVIEWERS REPORT – Determinants of rates of Non-Exclusive breast feeding in Nigeria

The topic, determinants of non-exclusive breastfeeding in Nigeria, is worthy of analysis given the negative health impacts of non-exclusive breastfeeding, such as increased infant morbidity and mortality. The data set appears to be complete and valid, and this topic is of particular importance in a resource-limited country like Nigeria.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Overall Comments

1) The statistical design is simple, yet appropriate for this type of analysis. However, the results are very difficult to follow as the authors switch from presenting predictors of EBF in univariate analysis, to BOTH predictors of EBF and predictors of non-EBF in the regression. As a result, the odds ratios are very difficult to interpret. I believe a simple fix for this would be to set up your analysis so that you are predicting the odds of EBF (and make the necessary changes to the text throughout the paper)

2) In the conclusion of your abstract, you state that the infant mortality rate in Nigeria is 100/1000. This should be addressed in further detail in the background section of the paper, as it highlights the importance of EBF.

3) The high percentage of mothers who are giving breastmilk and water is very important to present. Please spend more time explaining this in the results section, and in the discussion section.

4) I am curious as to why you selected 0-2 months, and 0-5 months as your ages for the outcome. It appears that you have data for the first 6 months of life, during which EBF is recommended. Also, please explain why you choose to look at both 0-2 and 0-5 month. These periods overlap, and it does not make much sense to compare EBF rates of 1 week old, to that of 5 month olds. Given the cross-sectional design of the study, it would be more meaningful to look at distinct time periods, and see if those distinct ages meet EBF goals – For example, EBF at 1 month of age and EBF at 6 months of age. (Also -You also state on page 8 paragraph 1 that your results suggest EBF in the first six months needs improving, yet the data you present is only up to 5 months).
5) This paper needs extensive language editing prior to acceptance for publication.

Background

6) Page 1: Please move the definition of EBF to the methods section of the paper.

7) Page 1: The BFHI is the initiative, but the hospitals should just be referred to as Baby-Friendly Hospitals. Also, please state briefly that the certification is from UNICEF-WHO etc…

8) Page 1: When you refer to the WHO recommendation of 90%, please put this into context. Is this 90% EBF in the hospital, at 6 months etc…

Discussion

9) Page 8 (second paragraph): Please rewrite the last sentence – so that it is not saying “supports the findings of citation, citation” etc…

10) Page 8 (third/fourth/fifth paragraph): Much of this material should be in the results section.

11) Page 9 (paragraph 3): This can be part of the discussion, but it needs to be further explained, and the citations should be specifically assigned to the confounders.

12) Page 9 (last paragraph): I am unclear why recall bias would be a limitation. If the data is a cross sectional snapshot, it is just assessing what the mothers were doing at the time of the interview.

Minor Essential Revisions

Abstract

13) Background: The last sentence is awkward.

Methods:

14) Please correct the first sentence to read: “Data on 658 children aged 0-5 months were obtained….”

15) Please remove the sentence about the EBF indicator and replace it with a sentence regarding the type of information that you analyzed.

16) Results: Please make months singular in the first sentence

Methods:

17) This survey was conducted (not “selected”)

Results

18) Page 5 (Second paragraph): You suggest in the table that mothers who did not have post-natal care also include mothers with missing information. What
percent of the 80.9% of mothers who did not have post-natal care were actually missing data?

19) Page 6 (First paragraph): The numbers listed here for figure 2 are not the same as the numbers in Figure 2.

20) Page 7 (First paragraph): Is the OR 1.54 or 1.55?
21) Page 7 (Second paragraph): Check the 95% CIs – as one is different in the table

Discussion
22) Page 8 (second paragraph): You state mothers who made “at least more than 4 antenatal clinic visits”, however in the table it appears to be “4 visits or more”.

23) Throughout the paper, there are many grammatical errors. When resubmitting, please thoroughly check the paper for grammatical errors, specifically singular/plural agreement, incomplete sentences, and missing words. A few examples are presented below.
• Fix capitalization in the title
• The last sentence in the 2nd paragraph is not a complete sentence.
• 3rd paragraph: Suggest starting the sentence with the word “The”.
• Top of page 5: Suggest “chi-squared tests were used”
• Results (first paragraph, last sentence) the word “visit” is missing

Discretionary Revisions
Methods:
24) Why were single women excluded from the analysis?
25) Abstract: Remove non significant findings from the abstract.
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