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Reviewer's report:

Overview
It is a very good study that adds to the needed knowledge pool for the improvement of child mortality in Nigeria. The objectives of the study are clearly stated; the methodology is clearly described; the data is sound; the conclusions reached are well balanced; related work are appropriately acknowledged; the title and abstract are appropriate; and the writing is acceptable.

However, the suggested revisions are stated below:

Discretionary Revisions

1. In the abstract, it is stated that there is no significant difference in the mean birth weight and gestational ages of babies born to mothers who used ITNs and those who did not. Yet, the conclusions included the recommendation of improved use of ITNs. The authors may consider reviewing the conclusions as contained in the abstract.

2. The limitation of the study should be acknowledged. This is a cross-sectional study with much of the data collected being what was reported by the mothers. Bearing in mind the educational level and social class of the majority of these mothers, there is a possibility of inaccurate reporting. The authors did make efforts to ensure as much accuracy as possible (e.g. use of Ballard scores with reported gestational ages where early ultrasound scans were unavailable). Also, in terms of the reasons for the use of the malaria control measures, ignorance of a/the method(s) as a whole was not included. It seems it was assumed that the mothers were definitely informed about the methods. Perhaps this is what is meant by the 'No reason' item but it would be beneficial to further clarify this.

Minor Revisions
There a few ‘typographical errors’. Some examples:

1. (Background) Page 4, Paragraph 1, Line 1/2 - Commas should come after the words “where” and “immunity” (not semi-colon).
2. (Background) Page 4, Paragraph 2, Line 1 – should read as “recommends”.
3. (Methods) Page 5, Paragraph 3, Line 3 – should read as “The U.C.H. is a tertiary...”
4. (Methods) Page 5, Paragraph 3, Line 5 – should be “ The two hospitals are the government-owned ...”
5. (Discussion) Page 10, Paragraph 2, Line 4 – should be “national”.
6. (Discussion) Page 11, Paragraph 1, Line 1 – should be “two-fold”.
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