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PMagnitude and Associated Factors of wasting among Under Five Orphans in Dilla Town, Southern Ethiopia: 2018: a cross-sectional study

REVIEW COMMENTS
The study is generally relevant as it focuses on undernutrition in orphans and what are the risk factors. Findings of which can help put in measures to prevent wasting in this group. However the way the manuscript is written does not

Abstract

Background
The background of the study provided in the abstract is not clear and needs rephrasing. It does not bring out the rationale/issues calling for the study clearly.

Method
The statements "A structured pretested interviewer administered questionnaire was used. Anthropometric measurements were also carried out complemented by focus group discussions and key informant in-depth interviews", do not read well. It could be rephrased to "A structured pretested interviewer administered questionnaire was used, complemented by focus group discussions and key informant in-depth interviews". Anthropometric measurements were also carried.

Justify the reason for entering all variables with p value of < 0.25 during bivariate logistic regression analysis into a multivariate analysis to identify variables independently associated with the outcome variable.

Results
The results reported that 11.1% orphans were wasted. What proportion of this were severely wasted?
Conclusion
What is the indication of the 11.1% wasting? Does it indicate an emergency situation? There are many factors the authors reported on to be associated with wasting. What should be the main interventions the findings of the study lead you to propose?

Introduction
Line 26: insert and by low productivity

Page 2
Line 40: could state This orphaned population……
Line 50-51 It is the major cause of illness and death among under-five children in the country…should be referenced.

Line 58 should state… A number of factors has…..

Page 3
Line 20 and 21…wasting should be w should not be in caps

Methods
Line 40-42 which s states the aim of the study should be moved to the introduction.

Source of and study population
This is also not clear and should be rewritten.
Data collection instrument and procedure
Page 4 lines 56-60: A pre-tested structured interviewer administered questionnaire was used for data collection in one of the kebele out of selected for sampling; it was adapted from different relevant studies and standards to meet the purpose…. This should be referenced with the relevant studies that were used.

Page 5: How many times were anthropometric measures taken? Was it done in duplicates or triplicates, and averages determined?

Explain how diversified balanced diet, food insecurity and wealth index were determined and the scores given.

Page 6: it is confusing why principal component analyses were performed. The questionnaires with had a series of questions for wealth index, diversified diet and food insecurity should be able to categorize the participants into different groups. If this is not so, then the PCA could be used to determine patterns and variability of these indices in the sample population. Explain.

Results
Page 8, Lines 27 to 31 are both not clear - "The number of under five children in a household two and above was 69(19.1%) and the greatest number was households with one orphan; i.e. 292(80.9%) for all
Socio-demographic information" need rephrasing.

Factors associated with wasting on page 9 need rewriting to bring out the meaning clearly.

Even though PCA is mentioned in the methods, no results of that is presented. This should be clarified.

Discussion
In this study, the prevalence of wasting is a bit higher than the study findings in Turkey(10.1%), India (9.9%) and Kenya (10%) regional prevalence of Amhara(9.8), SNNPR(6%), Dire dawa(9.7%) and Addis Abeba(3.5%) respectively [24,20,23, 26]…Couldn't the fact that your sample were orphans contribute to the higher proportion of wasting? Are the studies compared to among orphaned children?

Page 12, lines 39-41 should be rephrased.

Page 13 discussion of the factors associated with wasting is also not clear, probably because the language of the authors is not primarily English.

Page 13 - limitations should be described in details since there are many.

General comments
There are too many grammatical errors through the manuscript. The authors need an editor to check the language

Ethics
What sort of consent did the authors obtain from study participants?

Table 2
Exclusive breastfeeding - was it for 6 months? Specify

Figure 1 is not referred to at all throughout the manuscript.

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 recommend additional statistical review

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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