Reviewer’s report

Title: Beliefs and practices regarding childhood fever among parents: a cross-sectional study from Palestine

Version: 2 Date: 11 March 2013

Reviewer: Eric Wobudeya

Reviewer’s report:

This review is mainly focused on the data analysis and reporting. The previous review was limited to the methodology since it was not possible to evaluate the analysis and results when the methodology could not answer the questions.

Below are my second review comments

Major compulsory revisions

Comment 1
Page 2
Under Methods: line 4
Authors must indicate whether multiple response was used or not.
i recommend that multiple response be used since one participant can have more than one response.

Comment 2
Page 2
Under Results: line 5
There seems an error on the 12% in this line (see the table of results). The numbers do not add up. Please clarify.

Comment 3
Page 2
Under Results: line 6
This total is more than 100%. How many had multiple antipyretic uses? Explain.
If multiple responses, the appropriate analysis should be undertaken

Comment 4
Page 7
Under statistical analysis: line 2
For this type of multiple response data, multiple response analysis is the recommended. The authors should justify the alternative approach.

Comment 5
Page 7
Under Demographic data:
Line 3
General agreement is that percentages are to one decimal place.

Line 4
The study population is 6 months to 6 years. The divisions therefore are unnecessary. Otherwise the authors should explain the fundamental difference between 5 & 6 years to justify the division of under 5 and above 5 years.

Comment 6
Page 8
Under Parents' level of belief and understanding about the role of fever in illness:
Line 4
This definition of fever does not take into consideration the different routes the parents were using. Is this the standard definition of fever in Palestine? I recommend that the authors define fever according to the various routes and give a global report of fever or not. For the temperatures reported, the routes need to be indicated for the readers' assessment of the parents' understanding.

Comment 7
Table 2: page 19
Title: this title is not informative of the content of the table. Title too wordy and vague. Authors need to greatly improve this table title.

Under Variable “consideration of fever” is not informative variable. Requires improvement.

Under Variable “temperature of feverish child”, is this the temperature parents considered fever? If so, authors need to make this clear. How does this fit for those who recognized by touching?

Under Variable “Site use for measuring temperature” seems to have a typing error.

Under Variable “Harmful effects of fever”. The term organ damage is too vague. what did the authors exactly ask? How different is organ damage from brain damage?

Minor essential revisions

Discretionary revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests