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Reviewer’s report:

REVIEW
Perception and practice of Kangaroo Mother Care after discharge from hospital in Kumasi, Ghana: a longitudinal study

GENERAL ISSUE TO NOTE
Abstract
- Some sentences are too long
- There aren’t key words in the abstract. (They should include the following phrases: Kangaroo Mother care, Low birth weight, follow-up, practice, after discharge)
- The objective of the study stated in the abstract should be made the same as that in the article (To evaluate the practice KMC initiated in the hospital and after discharge without active supervision by health personnel or strict adherence to a study protocol).

Introduction
- Should be shorter. Some sentences were repeated, it should be in 1 sentence with some references. It is not necessary to repeat information in the narration
- To focus on perception and practice of KMC after discharge

Methods
- Continuous and intermittent KMC should be compared
- The outcome should be explained by incorporating the evaluation

Results
- There should be more informative description by table: Data when entering the study (mean birth weight, gestational age, age starting KMC) and information about 2 groups
- What has been in the table should not have been explained in the result

Discussion
- Some points did not support the data in the result
- Not well-managed, too long, confusing
Conclusion
  o Should be shorter to answer the objective
  o Some information was not appropriate

GUIDELINES
  1. Is the question posed by authors well defined?
     Some are, some are not
  2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
     The methods was not adequately appropriate. Outcome and some variable not well described
  3. Are the data sound? Adequate but should be improved
  4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
     Some information in the manuscript needs to be improved before reporting
  5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
     The discussion and conclusion are not well balanced
  6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes
  7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they building, but published and unpublished? Yes
  8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
     Yes, but it should be focused more on the title
  9. Is the writing acceptable?
     It needs major compulsory revision

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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