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Reviewer’s report:

Propositions Reviewer’s Comments
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Comment: To some extent
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Comments: Appropriately describe. Author has been analysed secondary data. Data source should be written clearly that data was taken from NIPORT or Measuredhs.
3. Are the data sound? Ok, I think
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Comment: Data capturing not clear. How the data was obtained from primary source, is not clear.
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Comment: Rewrite the discussion based on result and give cross reference appropriately. Authors describe result in discussion.
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Comment: Not written. Required
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Comment: Rewrite the acknowledgments. Authors do not acknowledge themselves.
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Comment: Acceptable
9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Comment: Plenty of grammatical error. Need correction. It should be accepted after major correction.
10. Overall comments
   Comment: Poorly written manuscripts

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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Rewrite the acknowledgments. Authors do not acknowledge themselves. There is gross conflict of interest