

# Review of: "How Competent are Health Professionals in Delivering Nutrition Education? A Cross-Sectional Study in Ebonyi State, Nigeria"

Maria Pramila D Costa

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## Peer Review Report

- **First look**

- The content of the manuscript is communicated clearly and appropriately.
- The manuscript addresses a valid research question.
- The language is simple and easy to comprehend.

- **Title**

- The title is clear and concise.

- **Abstract**

- The abstract is self-sufficient and without any citation.
- The abstract summarized well.

- **Introduction**

The introduction and the background lack what is known from the previous literature, hence lacking clarity in the gap identified. However, the authors have clearly stated the study's aim, which is consistent with the rest of the manuscript.

The suggestion is to **add more review literature supporting the background**

- **Methodology:**

- The main ideas or findings of the manuscript are presented.
- The study design and approach have been sufficiently described and appropriately addressed the research question.

• However, the authors **have not included all the essential information (psychometric properties) regarding the study instrument in the manuscript.** Need to mention the validation and reliability details of the instruments.

- It would be better to specify if there is any reference number for the Ethical review approval.

**Page 5: Please ensure the study used 21 variables, or the authors misworded it as variables instead of items.**

The table titles are self-explanatory. However, there is a mistake in Table 5 regarding the professional status specific to the dentist. A value of 10 digits with no subtitle in that column. • In a few places, tables inaccurately represent the results.

- All tables cited consecutively in the text.
- All tables have a concise, descriptive title clearly explaining what is presented.

**Table 5 shows how the adequacy of the competency is computed is not clearly stated**

The discrepancy in results in page 13, paragraph 2, first line. Results are stated wrongly. Eg.

**"From the results of our study, respondents with postgraduate-level training were four times as likely to demonstrate" more likely or less likely?**

**Future recommendations to be added**

- **References**
- Essential references required to support the manuscript's statements are missing in paragraph 5 of page 1.
- There are no inappropriate citations, for example, those not directly supporting a statement or claims.

**The overall rating of the article is 3.5 out of 5.**

Peer reviewer's best wishes to the authors

**Dr. Maria Pramila D'Costa**

**Assistant Science Teacher**

**Oman College of Health Sciences NB Branch**

**Suhar Oman**

**Email: mariapramila@rediffmail.com**