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Reviewer's report:

Method

To find reasons for initiation of complementary feeding at different ages, you defined some reason a priori. Why did not you ask open question instead, and did not let the mothers respond the questions by their own words. If you had done that you may have collected some more interesting and not anticipated results.

Result

As far as I know level of statistical significance in medical sciences is 0.05, however to my surprise, in the bottom of table 4 you have mentioned:"statistically significant at 20% level of significance". Why?

Likewise, in that table for Antenatal care Attendance, Birth preparedness, Postnatal care attendance and Parity the confidence interval(95%CI) for Crude OR crosses 1 which implies there is no difference between arms of the study! But you concluded there was a significant difference between two arms. Why?

Discussion

Page 15 lines 24 to 29 you've mentioned"The urban women in this study may have better employment opportunities that facilitate higher incomes, as well as access to higher quality health facilities where they may be exposed to health education during their pregnancies". I did
not understand how the authors reckon the mentioned mother had better employment opportunities and in result higher income?
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