Reviewer’s report

Title: Prevalence and associated factors of undernutrition among under-five children from model and non-model Households in East Gojjam Zone, Northwest Ethiopia: A comparative cross-sectional study

Version: 0 Date: 08 Sep 2018

Reviewer: Reviewer 2

Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS: To view the full report from the academic peer reviewer, please see the attached file.

REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: The study used sound methodology and technology for assessment of anthropometry among under-5 children. However, there are some factual details unclear in the manuscript they have written. Further, the analyses they have carried out is weak to infer the associations between outcomes and associated factors. The detailed suggestion are given below. There are numerous writing errors, typos and so on.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
'Under nutrition', 'under weight' these mean the same thing, please rectify. In background, authors should provide a strong arguments for why such a survey in West Gojjam Zone was required and why they had to present results by model and non-model households, by giving how health-related issues differed by the type of households.

Objective does not mentions the factors associated with anthropometric indices, whereas the authors have done multivariate analyses.

Abstract, reports simple random sampling, while in the methods section they report "Multistage sampling technique", which has not been described in detail.

Improved water supply, improved toilet have to be defined.

Authors did not provide a framework for factors associated with child anthropometric indices. I see 3 major flaws with this approach to analyses.

1) separate analyses by type of household gave few model households, lack of power in logistic regression
2) use of original Z score would be recommended than dichotomising the variables, again would give more power to associations
3) non-use of conceptual has lead to omission of some proximal and distal associations with
undernutrition (food intake as quantity, dietary diversity, infectious diseases, so on). For these reasons analyses is the weakest link in this paper.

Discussion is another weak section, with only comparison with previous studies, without adequate contextualization of the results to the survey site or Ethiopia, authors do not acknowledge any limitations, or suggestions for future directions for research. Conclusion does not interpret the main findings and suggest solutions, it merely repeats the findings from results section.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
none

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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