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Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions

In Abstract, author stated that one of the activities on Posyandu is “Monitoring the Nutritional Status”. The term is quite unusual to be used. It should be “growth Monitoring”.

On the conclusion part of abstract, the author did not “conclude” the research. The author just give a “suggestion” to the readers, which is the author doesn't have or collect the data on those. Author is asked to revised this to more a “conclusion” sentences of their research.

We've read carefully the abstract, but we didn’t find that we mentioned one of the activities on Posyandu. We have already concluded the result and recommendation based on our findings.

The Introduction: 5th paragraph must be revised. In addition author are asked to add the description about Posyandu; the activity that includes in it, the people who are involved, and the classification of Posyandu itself (and please explain whether is it belongs to “independent Posyandu” or else, based on its’ daily activities, facilities and infrastructure, funds, readiness of voluntary workers, etc.). The reviewer questions the author whether the author have consider the classification, that is Posyandu has a variety of, when constructing its’ sampling frame, because in the practice, the classification of Posyandu is closely related to the participation level of subject.

The 5th paragraph has been already revised. We described Posyandu criteria.

In Materials and Method, it is stated that data collection was conducted by the staff from Primary Health Center. The reviewer is concerned whether the data collection was biased by the conflict of interest of the interviewers/data collector. Please author respond to this matter, in order to make the readers convinced that the data is valid without any bias.

The main data collectors are us. There was no conflict of interest with nutrition staff because before collecting data we met up and explained our purpose. The staff have already accustomed in gathering Posyandu data as the monthly report to district health office.

In Materials and Method: 2nd paragraph on Subject of Research, it is stated that the author done a “multistage random sampling”. Reviewer suggest that the author should add more description about the sampling frame itself such as how many villages are involved, the sample size calculation (if any), and the inclusion-exclusion criteria of sample.

In methods part, we already mentioned the inclusion-exclusion criteria.

In Materials and Method: 3rd paragraph on Subject of Research, it is stated that ethical clearance was given by Research ethics committee from Japan and permitted from local
Indonesia Government. Since the research was carried out in Indonesia, shouldn’t the author ask the approval from ethics committee in Indonesia first before conducting the research, rather than just had the author’s institution reviewed it? If any approval was reached with local government, please state that the author was done so.

We involve in linkage program Gunma University and Universitas Padjadjaran. We had ethics clearance from Gunma University because the study design and protocol were developed in the university which are known by Universitas Padjadjaran supervisors. We neither publish the raw data nor use them for others purposes that can harm or endanger Indonesia. Then, the raw data and questionnaire are discarded and shred. Based on that, the local government permitted to collect the data on March 7th 2014.

In general, the reviewer regard the paper has many flaw on its’ grammar and structure. Reviewer assumed that the author translate the original text per each word without being proofread. Author is asked to revise it before it can be accepted.

The English of this manuscript has been checked by an English editing service for scientific manuscripts and the style of the manuscript has a little revision.

- Minor Essential Revisions

In Results: 1st paragraph, it is kind of unfit that only 54.5% of respondent being 30 years old were called “most”. Author was asked to revise the statement.

    We revised “most” to “about half of respondents.”

In Results: 2nd paragraph, author stated that the percentage of mothers with higher education attended more than 6 times per year slightly higher than the other group. Being only 1% of difference (50.3% in higher education group as compared to 49.3% among basic education group , table 2), it is clearly inconclusive that the education parameter has any significance to the attended frequency to the posyandu.

    Yes, it is true that education parameter has no significant association with mothers’ participation. However, we must show the data as well as the significant association.

In Results: 2nd paragraph, the attitude, satisfaction, and intention of mothers are being taken as conclusion. These three parameters are not as clear as it is stated. Author was relating these parameters with an uneven reason to come back to Posyandu, which is “free” being compared with “monitoring status”. Moreover, reviewer thinks these reasons are not related and not on the same level to each other, i.e.; “free” and “near” is not the service they got when going to Posyandu, on the other hand, “immunization”, “food supplement” and “growth monitoring” are one of those. In addition, these “reasons of coming back to Posyandu” shouldn’t be only one. The later one is fit to be a “reason” of these satisfaction, attitude, and interest parameter since it tightly related to the service that Posyandu offers to these mothers and their children, rather than the first one being just a “trivia” reasons to come back to Posyandu. Author is asked to revise/divide these parameters and describe it more clearly to ensure there is no misunderstanding about these results.
About the reasons of respondents attend Posyandu, such as near and free, come up from community itself. Regarding respondents’ view, distance and free are part of the Posyandu service. Some villages established more than 1 Posyandu to overcome the problem. Moreover because of poor people, they won’t access Posyandu if they have to pay (out of pocket)

- Discretionary Revisions

The Introduction: 4th paragraph is not needed. Author can dispose that part since it has no real correlation to the article.

We should describe shortly about the Posyandu history. We consider that our readers are not only Indonesians, but also foreigners.

In Data Analysis, author gave a variable of marital status. Reviewer asked whether it has given any importance, since the percentage of it was too small (5.5%).

We knew the percentage was too small after collecting and analyzing data. So, we have to include the variable, even though it has no given any importance.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions
The title should be revised. Connect to the main findings of the multivariate. The title Not related to major findings.

We think that the title and findings are related

too much figure in background, concise it.

We compare the participation in the national level and province level for 3 years. We know the trend after we examine among them.

methods must concise with effective sentences. There should be no repetition.

There is no repetition

Concise it, related to main findings.

Already concised

too much figure in introduction. describe the rational of the main findings to be disclosed.
paragraph 1, 2 and 3 condensed into one paragraph (describe the magnitude of problem). The paragraph needs minimal 2 sentences. Describe previous studies on the factors causing low participation of mothers to posyandu, related to main findings of this study. The introduction need revisited and more improvement.

We described the nutrition problem for 3 years with 3 indicators. How is great the problem in Indonesia and Aceh Province in 3 periods? then does the problem achieve WHO target?

Is the number of respondent 385 could represent a district? The multistage sampling must explain more detail.

The number of respondents are already mentioned as the limitation study. The sampling already revised

Explain how development of the instrument and reliability and validity of the instrument. (The authors should show us the questionnaire as supplemental data)

We modified WHO questionnaire and other questionnaire related to community participation

Who were collecting the data and how the recruitment of the enumerators? Explain it.

Already explained in Methods part paragraph 1
Table 1, no need anymore!!
Because it already explained in the text.
   We develop table to summarize the text

this table: no need. Delete from the paper. Explain in methods with simple explanation.
   We develop table to summarize the text

Do not narrate the table!! but interpret the results briefly and clearly.
Too much figures in the result.
Just Interpret!
And make it concise!
   Some people are not comfortable to read tables or figures. Therefore I provide the
narration as well.

Interpretation of the results and key findings not sound yet.
Revisited it and need improvement over all.
Related to other studies, especially the main findings that wish to express or want overlooked.
Limited of this study should be explain in the text about the possibility of the bias.

   Yes, there is the possibility of the bias

References should be change. Related to major findings. (more improve to the research articles or
journals).
Search another related journal which similar population (mothers) and similar variables (participation of
posyandu!!).

   We used the references that closed to our topic. We’ve already used references
related to Posyandu, however my reviewer in my campus refused because they were not
published yet internationally.

the highlight: not related to main finding and the results!!

NO need figure 1-5.
   Explain it in the text only.
No repetition!!

   We need figures 1-5 in order readers can imagine how difference of reasons in each
category

the tables should be compressed into just one or 2 tables.
why used exact fisher? (the table just 2 by 2 and how the cells?)
the authors must show us the raw data. Or The authors must re-analysis with chi-square or logistic
regression.

   Fisher exact test is used for two category variables and when the sample size is
small. This test is more accurate than the chi-square test when the total sample size is less
than 1000. We apologize that we can’t show the raw data because we already have
appointment with local government. The data belong to the local government.

Intention and freq of participation was similar variable.
Intention is an anticipated outcome that is intended or that guides your planned actions. Meanwhile, frequency is the occurrences within a given period.

Which the Reference, write in (...) Why the immunization referenced to other reasons?

Reference is a baseline of other options. In this case, immunization is a baseline of other reasons. We’ve read in another journal, reference is not written in the brackets

interpret the AIC more detail and explain it in the results.

Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) is a way for model selection. The one with the minimum AIC value is the preferred model.

table 5 and 6, made it one table. Already established these tables in one table

We need figures 1-4 in order readers can imagine how difference of reasons in each category

figure 2-5 no need. Explain in the result with narrative and effective sentences.

We need figures 2-5 in order readers can imagine how difference of reasons in each category

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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**Title:** Factors Influencing Mothers' Participation in Posyandu for Improving Nutritional Status of Children Under-Five in Aceh Utara District, Aceh Province, Indonesia

**Version:** 2  
**Date:** 13 February 2015

**Reviewer:** ANURADHA R

**Reviewer's report:**

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?  
   ans: yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
   ans: can explain about the multistage sampling method.  
   Clarification needed on whether an interview schedule was used or a questionnaire used.
   
   *We modified questionnaires from WHO and other researches related health program or health services*

3. Are the data sound?  
   ans: yes

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?  
   ans: yes

5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?  
   ans: To an extent. In result section many data are just repeated which can be inferred from the table itself. Key finding can be highlighted. Language could have been better. Terms like more than half / less than half frequently used which can be avoided.
   
   *Already revised*

6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?  
   ans: Yes

7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?  
   ans: yes

8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?  
   yes

9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?  
   yes

10. Is the writing acceptable?  
    ans: yes. can avoid repetition. can improve writing skills.

   *Minor essential review*

   1. data analysis section-para 1-it should be confidence interval and not cot confident interval
2. Discussion section - 8th para - second point - spelling error - specific instead of spesific; malnourished instead of malnurished

3. Figure 2, 3, 4, 5 - reasons - percentage is not depicted on the bar diagrams.

We developed each figure in bar chart because it is a simple and understandable chart for categorical data.

**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.

**Declaration of competing interests:** 'I declare that I have no competing interests'