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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

In my first review I raised certain issues to be addressed especially in the discussion part of the paper. The authors tried to formulate the discussion based on the comments given; however there is no substantial difference. I am not still satisfied by their discussions.

1. I haven’t seen any paragraph that states the prevalence of diarrhea, in the result section please state the prevalence and discuss this prevalence according to the study area relating it with the cultural and social aspects of the study area comparing it with different literatures.

2. Support your arguments with different literatures. In most of the cases the authors tried to discuss their results comparing with different studies, that is a good effort. However, their assumptions are not well discussed by supporting it with different literatures. For example, in paragraph 2 (the discussion part) the authors tried to discuss why children from those parents who earn a better income is less likely to develop diarrhea, they attached it with a better use of soap, latrine construction, hand washing facilities……. The question is why these families use these materials better than others? Is that because they have a better income or a better understanding of the materials……. Just try to discuss it deeply by taking other factors into consideration. Use literatures that are important to the topic which can strengthen your argument. In paragraph 3 it is stated that the contribution of climate zone, availability of latrine,………… are not associated with diarrhea and contrasted with other studies, in their discussion it is again stated that “This might be due their contribution to the occurrence of childhood diarrhoea was small in comparison to other variables”. Why the contribution might be small compared with other variables? This has to be addressed and discussed deeply.

3. The important finding where “children from non-model families were more likely to develop diarrhea than model families” is not discussed satisfactorily; here the authors can raise many things in relation with model and non-model families. The importance of health promotion and education to prevention of diarrhea…….Since the objective of the article is directly related to risk factors between model and non-model families, the discussion has to be elaborated
more about model and non-model families.

Generally, the discussion which is very important part of an article lacks depth. Hope this paper can be improved if it is formulated as per the comment given.

Minor Essential Revisions

The figures in Table 2 about “water treatment at home” and the description presented on page 7 are not the same. Please check it

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.
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