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Reviewer’s report:

I made my comments and suggestions line-by-line (point-by-point) in the body of the manuscript (which is in Microsoft word sent from the editors by request). There, I tried my best to see each section form their scientific merit only (refer a document "hygiene behavior" attached with this reviewer report). I also made general comments, on each section of the manuscript. In no way, the points described below are the only comments I made. there are detailed and mores specific comments and suggestions that are made on the body of the manuscript. So, I suggest for the authors to concentrate more on those comments and suggestions than only make their basis on the points given below.

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. There is a need to edit the whole document for English language and grammatical construction
2. The assumptions during calculating the sample size are not indicated
3. The sampling procedure is not well described. Accordingly, many questions might arise from the way the samples are selected. From the very beginning, you do not tell us how many elementary schools found in the study area. Are all included? If some of them were selected, how many and what were the selection criteria? You use proportionate allocation of the 528 sample. Was that proportionate allocation to the selected schools or to classes (grade 6-8) as well?
4. Limitation and strength of the study are not shown
5. Most of the discussion part is the same as the result part. Findings were presented as they were also shown in the result part without discussion. They lack interpretation, comparing the finding of this study with the other findings. The entire part of the second page of the discussion part lacks interpretation, comparison and contrast
6. Your conclusion is simply copy the main findings. Rather you have to analyze and present in a comprehensive and concise form.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. The background part should contain three major parts. 1) What is known in relation to the study topic? 2) What is unknown (the knowledge gap) and 3) the response (what is expected from this study)? In the current study, the background contains many description of the known facts (what is known), but
fail to clearly show the gap. At the same time the objectives of the study are not clearly shown.

2. Too much description of the problem makes the background longer than expected

3. You should clearly show how you measure variables. For example; how behavior was measured is not clear. From the very beginning, you should justify how behavior is measured by asking people. How many questions were used? How the responses were analyzed? The same is true for knowledge and awareness, how they were measured?

4. The result from observation of the students’ house is not presented. There are some on table 2, but it is not still clear whether the findings are from observation or what students have replied during the quantitative questionnaire survey.

5. Many of the texts in the result part lacks clarity

6. Some findings shown in the discussion part were not seen in the result part

7. There is no clear recommendation. However, it can be seen from the conclusion part that half of the conclusion part is recommendation. You may change the sub-title as ‘conclusion and recommendation’.

8. I don’t agree on the last recommendation where authors suggest for further research. I didn't see the need for additional research on the points you raised. Because these points (enabling factors on hygiene behavior, motivational factors, parents’ health package) were already assessed in your study and I didn’t see any constrain what so ever because of the study designs limitation.

Discretionary Revisions

1. Some of the texts do not have a direct link to the topics studied.

2. The basic socio-demographic characteristic of the study participants is not shown either in a text or diagram.

General comments about a manuscript “Assessment of factors influencing hygiene behaviour among school children in Mereb-Leke District, Northern Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study

1. Background

a. There is a need to edit the whole document, including the background part, for English language and grammatical construction

b. The background part should contain three major parts. 1) What is known in relation to the study topic? 2) What is unknown (the knowledge gap) and 3) the response (what is expected from this study)? In the current study, the background contains many description of the known facts (what is known), but fail to clearly show the gap. At the same time the objectives of the study are not clearly shown.
c. Some of the texts do not have a direct link to the topics studied.
d. Too much description of the problem makes the background too long

2. Methodology
   a. The assumptions during calculating the sample size are not indicated
   b. The sampling procedure is not well described. Accordingly, many questions might arise from the way the samples are selected. From the very beginning, you do not tell us how many elementary schools found in the study area. Are all included? If some of them were selected, how many and what were the selection criteria? You use proportionate allocation of the 528 sample. Was that proportionate allocation to the selected schools or to classes (grade 6-8) as well?
   c. You should clearly show how you measure variables. For example; how behavior was measured is not clear. From the very beginning, you should justify how behavior is measured by asking people. How many questions were used? How the responses were analyzed? The same is true for knowledge and awareness, how they were measured?

3. Result
   a. Many of the texts in the result part lacks clarity
   b. The basic socio-demographic characteristic of the study participants is not shown either in a text or diagram.
   c. The result from observation of the students’ house is not presented. There are some on table 2, but it is not still clear whether the findings are from observation or what students have replied during the quantitative questionnaire survey.

4. Discussion
   a. Limitation and strength of the study are not shown
   b. Some findings shown in the discussion part were not seen in the result part
   c. Most of the discussion part is the same as the result part. Findings were presented as they were also shown in the result part without discussion. They lack interpretation, comparing the finding of this study with the other findings. The entire part of the second page of the discussion part lacks interpretation, comparison and contrast

5. Conclusion
   Your conclusion is simply copy the main findings. Rather you have to analyze and present in a comprehensive and concise form.

6. Recommendation
   a. There is no clear recommendation. However, it can be seen from the conclusion part that half of the conclusion part is recommendation. You may change the sub-title as ‘conclusion and recommendation’.
   b. I don’t however agree on the last recommendation where authors suggest for further research. I didn’t see the need for additional research on the points you
raised. Because these points (enabling factors on hygiene behavior, motivational factors, parents’ health package) were already assessed in your study and I didn’t see any constrain what so ever because of the study designs limitation. I have also made several specific comments that I have included in the manuscript texts. I vote for this manuscript should be critically revised and resubmitted.
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