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This study is trying to assess factors associated with the early termination of exclusive breastfeeding among mother-infant dyads in Samara-Logia, Northeastern Ethiopia. This is a cross sectional survey to collect data from 465 mothers using structured questionnaire. Health information is scarce especially in agrarian communities; in that sense, this study is valuable. The document is generally good. However the discussion part is weak and there are some points to be cleared to understand the study itself and to interpret it scientifically.

**Abstract**

1. Background section - line 11 & 12 - justification of the study: the current justification is not convincing. It doesn't clearly show the importance of doing this research. The research question is well researched in Ethiopia, but health information is limited among agrarian communities. This can be justification for this study.

2. Method section: better if you include the sample size. In addition, do not mention the software you used to analyze in the abstract section.

3. Result section: the results are presented well. My comment here is to add 95% CI for the cumulative proportion of exclusive breastfeeding.

4. Key words: the current key words need revision. Most of the key words are associated with the study area.

**Background**

1. Line 39 & 40 - EBF during 2012 is almost outdated. Please use recent citations.

2. Line 45 - it will be clearer for the readers if you include contributing factors for the lower proportion of EBF.
3. Page 2 - line 7 and 8: authors mentioned that the purpose of the study is to investigate the socio-demographic and biomedical factors. So, was your investigation restricted in socio-demographic and biomedical factors?

Methods

1. Study setting and design- typo issue. Authors used the phrase "cross sectional" in the previous part of the document. Now they used the term "cross-sectional". Which one is correct? Anyway, be consistent. Moreover, description of the area directly related with the study question like birthrate and number of women in the reproductive age group.

2. Sample size determination: you took a result of a study conducted in Goba district to calculate sample size. However, there is a study conducted in the same region which I thing the study populations are quite the same. If it is possible lease use it. The research is:


3. Data collection and instrument - line 5 - 8: you used many articles to prepare the questionnaire. Please select the most important articles to reduce number of references.

4. Study variables - line 3 - 47: you included too many predictor variables.

5. Data processing and analysis: the univariable analysis is not used to assess the effect of predictors on outcome variable. It is used to select predictors for the final model. Please correct the analysis plan considering this. In addition, how you check model fitness?

6. Ethical consideration: As per the journal guideline, it is not the correct place for ethical consideration. You also include it under the declaration section which is the correct place. Please remove it from the method section.

Results

1. Maternal and infant health service utilization: Authors took "yes" for ANC visit if mothers attended at least one visit. However, there is recommended number of ANC visits in Ethiopia. Why not you took the recommended number?

2. Infant feeding practice: how do you calculate cumulative proportion? Please include 95% CI for the cumulative proportion. Why you included both mean and median for the EBF. One is enough to measure central tendency. Select either mean or median based on the nature of the data. Choose mean with SD if the data is normally distributed or median with interquartile range if the data is not normally distributed. SD deviation is not appropriate for median. Moreover, this information (The minimum and maximum duration of exclusive breastfeeding were zero and six months, respectively) is misleading and conflicting with the information in table 3. Please cross check it.
3. Factors affecting duration of EBF - line 32 to 45: As I mentioned above, the univariable analysis is not used to identify factors associated with outcome variable. It is used to select variables for the final model. Which variables were entered to the univariable model and which fulfilled its assumptions?

Discussion

1. Include 95% CI for the proportion of EBF.

2. The first paragraph of the discussion needs revision. It contains some misleading comparisons. Moreover, I recommend authors to compare their result with a study conducted in the same population which I mentioned in the sample size calculation part. Authors should also include the justification why their finding is lower/higher compared with the findings of other studies.

3. Paragraph 2: the justification given for the effect of husband education on EBF is not convincing. Please refer other relevant articles which show the relationship b/n husband education and EBF. This sentence "Similar findings were reported at Australia "in the same paragraph is incomplete.

4. Paragraph 3: the justification given for the effect of infant feeding counseling on EBF is not properly justified. As a justification, authors should discuss why infant feeding counseling affects EBF.

5. Paragraph 4: this sentence "Similar findings reported at Hawassa city, Azezo district and Bahir Dar city" is incomplete. In addition, the link between health institution delivery and EBF is not justified. Baby- friendly hospital is not the scope of this study. It is better if you remove it from this manuscript.

Strength and limitation

1. Do not include strength in the manuscript.

2. Limitation of the study: limitation of cross-sectional study is not a limitation for this study because this study was not aimed to assess causality. Recall bias is really a limitation. So, what you did to minimize this bias?

Conclusion: the conclusion in the abstract section is good than this.
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