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Reviewer's report:

Overview: The authors of the above named paper have devoted efforts to evaluating sleeping habits, net maintenance behaviour, ownership, utilization and challenges associated with LLIN use in a North central Nigerian city following mass distribution of nets in the state. The study was conducted using standard methods as a cross sectional survey approach was adopted by the investigators. The manuscript is well written, and the results have been clearly presented in a well standardized format while the outcome of the study has relevant public health implications. The statement of problem has been well defined and the study has carefully addressed the question posed. The title of the study and the abstract provide good insight into what has been done by the authors.

Minor Essential revisions:

1. Page 2- abstract: Under the result section, line 4:
   a. Change spend to spent
   b. Time 1900-2300 to read 19.00 -23.00hr

2. Page : sixth line from bottom; grammar needs to be changed
   a. .....before entering to sleep under such nets to read ....before sleeping under the nets

3. Page 5 materials and method:
   a. What is the population size in each of the 3 local government areas or Ilorin city as a whole since authors considered all 3 local government that make up the city as one block. This information needs to be included in the study area section.
   b. How did the authors determine the sample size used in the study. The sample size calculation needs to be included under the study design. Was your sample size representative of the population that was studied?

4. Page 7- 10 (Results), page 11 – discussion
   a. Authors should consider using either the proportion (213/250) or percentage (85%) rather than using both (213 (85%) out of 250...) in description of the results as seen on pages 7-10. This is also seen on page 11 of the discussion. It makes reading cumbersome.

5. Figure 1: provides useful insight on the nature of discomfort experienced by
LLIN users with majority complaining of chemical poisoning amongst other discomforts. The authors need to include the implications of this findings in their discussion which at present is missing from the discussion.

6. Page 20-21 – Tables 2 and 3
a. The titles of these tables need to be better constructed and more explicit.

7. The limitations of the work need to be included

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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