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Reviewer’s report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are minor issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

No - there are issues with the statistics in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: The authors did a good job. The paper is much better. There are still 3 major issues that are easy to answer before recommending publication.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

There are still some minor concerns regarding the language and some repetitions that could easily be fixed (see for example page 6 lines 42.., also see Anthropometric measurements were converted into Z-sore values using WHO Anthro version 3.2.2 software for the indices.. etc..). Please insert reference 19 after the related modified text etc..

Many unnecessary linking words such as : Accordingly, in addition, Likewise, Thus,... consider removing.

In abstract sentences need to be revised such as : Similarly, not fed on cow milk (AOR= 2.90, 95%CI: 1.40, 6.00), duration of breast feeding (AOR= 2.60, 95%CI: 1.35, 5.00), dietary diversity score (< 4 food groups) (AOR= 6.30, 95%CI: 1.70, 23.00), mothers' poor hand washing practice (AOR= 2.50, 95%CI: 1.30,4.70) ??

I have still a major comment regarding data and one point of discussion and one on conclusion:

Prevalence of undernutrition among children aged 24-59 months

Of the total children participated in the study, 28.4% were found to be stunted, 10% wasted and 13.4% were underweight. Among all children, 6.7% of them were both stunted and wasted.

Thank you for providing this information but there is some discrepancy, can you check it ? How you can find more than 10% mixed undernutrition when you have only estimate 10% wasted ? Can you revise ?

I am also surprised by the low % or underweight compared to wasted and stunted.

I understand your point on cow milk feeding but I disagree on the presentation. The problem is that people may believe that you talk of formula feeding which has been devastating for children mortality compared to breastfeeding (your following discussion paragraph confirmed this well known fact). Please clarify your statements, time of introduction, the cow source a,d method of feeding and  and differentiate cow milk feeding from formula in abstract, results, and discussion.

Please revise your general conclusion, be more specific.
Minor comments

Abstract

Probably better to quote « multivariate analysis » in abstract than « separate »

Conclusion: be more specific, see comments.

Main text

You might consider shortening and revising tables:
Table 1 by adding a column for Father, for example, and using sex ratio.
Table 2,3 by removing the "no" response line in yes/no
Table 4 and following: some editing are unnecessary
(with 95 %CI) … COR (95 %CI) is fine and usual in papers ; idem for « in month »: (month) is fine
« <3/day » is fine and shorter than « Less than three times/day »
Unable to read and write 24 49 2.07(0.86,4.96) 1.91(0.51,7.18) please remove , and add -

Did you define Food insecurity in definition section?

The result of Hosmer and Lemshow test was >0.24 : You probably need to remove the related result from method section.

Factors associated with undernutrition section

Please simplify the result presentation by giving the order of your analysis in the first sentence.

Discussion is much better

Consider comparing only urban town in your discussion, you may also compare urban and rural to point out, what are the differences ?
in University of Virginia (27)… This is misleading and strange…rather state ..in Cambodia

Consider adding one point of discussion :

Please how far your findings are complementary/ in adequation with WHO recommendations ? Could you ?
Conclusion

This study confirmed the high prevalence of undernutrition in the study area

Please be more specific, drop study area and replace urban setting of..

The household family size, birth order and meal frequency were significantly associated with stunting.

Idem here : household family size above 4,

Remove : The finding of this study also indicated that… please go to the point

In

addition, feeding cow milk as complementary food, see my above comment

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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