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Reviewer's report:

A. Review of “The association of living conditions with rest deprivation amongst Ghanaian women: a cross-sectional nationally representative survey” by Mittelmark and Bull.

This manuscript should be combined with “Social determinants of rest deprivation amongst Ghanaian women: urban-rural comparisons with data from a cross-sectional nationally representative survey” by Mittelmark and Bull. The data sets are the same and results are stronger if presented together, especially since there are no clear conclusions.

B. Review of “Social determinants of rest deprivation amongst Ghanaian women: urban-rural comparisons with data from a cross-sectional nationally representative survey”

General:

This is an interesting study that is potentially vital for our understanding of rest and its determinants in women in third world conditions.

Manuscript should be combined with those in “The association of living conditions with rest deprivation amongst Ghanaian women: a cross-sectional nationally representative survey” by Mittelmark and Bull into one report.

1. The question is well defined.
2. The methods have some problems: (1) Why was a cutoff of 6 hrs used? Why was a continuous variable not used? Is this the reason for poor model fit? (2) No statement is made whether correlations among variables were tested or accounted for in the multivariate model.
3. One question about the data: Could the illiterate women “tell time”? Did they have an accurate assessment of time spent in rest.
4. Data deposition is referenced
5. Discussion and conclusion minimize the problem that the models fit the data very poorly. Indeed the prediction accuracy was 0% for one measure. The authors should not draw so many conclusions with such a poor fitting model.
6. Limitations of the work are clearly stated.
7. Prior work is cited..
8. Titles are appropriate. However, the conclusion of the Abstracts overstate results

9. Writing is acceptable.

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

1. Combine the two reports

2. Move the statement about doing multivariate logistic analyses using significant indicators from Results to Methods

3. Methods: Make clearer that did both testing of individual measures and with these measures as part of a model.

4. Methods: why were All non-Christian in one category? Why was not Muslim a separate category?

5. Methods: Do analysis by continuous (hrs rest) rather than dichotomous (rest vs rest deprivation). Or, provide good rationale why six hours was chosen as a cutoff. Do this for both individual measures and as part of a model.

6. Methods: Consider using one model for both the capital and rural areas but with an indicator variable for the location of the women.

7. Methods: What were the correlations between variables? Was adjustment made in the model for them? Were attempts made to redo the model with some of the variables significant individually removed, especially if there were correlations among the variables? How were variables added/subtracted from the model?

8. Methods: How were sample weights calculated?

9. Methods: Speak with statistician about other statistical measures that may enable a better fitting model. If a better fitting model is not obtained, then alter the conclusions.

10. Methods: Could the illiterate women “tell time”? Did they have an accurate assessment of time spent in rest.

**Minor**

1. P8 typo. “.. seven or (not of) more…”

**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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