

Review of: "Maternal Misconceptions Against Infant Sunlight Exposure Are Still Bottlenecks in Northwest Ethiopia, by 2022"

Merkinah Markos Lorato

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Comments to the author

1. Your manuscript title and its objective should be inline. Therefore, please make some modifications to your title section to inline it with your main objective. I personally recommend the title to be "Knowledge, practice, and factors affecting sunlight exposure of infants among women attending Debre Tabor Comprehensive Specialized Hospital, Ethiopia, 2022."

Abstract

1. The method section should express some information about the sample size...
2. Please replace "Bivariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses" with the bivariable and multi-variable logistic regression analyses.
3. In the results section of your abstract, please consider including the AOR of each associated factor with its 95%CI.
4. Did you do multinomial regression??? I don't think so. Look at the last line of your results section in the abstract.
5. Consider language revision throughout your abstract.

Introduction/Background

1. SNNPR: Please don't abbreviate when things appear for the first time in your text, and as per my knowledge, Aleta Wondo is not part of SNNPR recently. Please edit it.
2. I saw some mix-up in your background section. Please merge the information (previous research works) that reveals the level of knowledge and practice among participants, which reflects the direct image of your study population. So, merge literature on the level of knowledge into one paragraph and the literature that revealed the practice status of mothers into another single paragraph.
3. Throughout your background section, please consider language issues.
4. Where is the problem statement?? And the significance of your study??? For me, any study that doesn't explain the necessity of the study never sounds scientifically sound. Please include text that describes the statement of the problem and the significance of the study at the end of your background information.

Methods and materials

1. The information you provided about the study area lacks some important details about Debre Tabor Comprehensive Hospital....How many mothers are there in post-natal maternal and child care? How many mothers attend the clinic per month, per day, or per week? And how many of the neonates/infants/pediatrics are affected by Rickets/Vitamin D deficiency??? What are the commonest causes of infant mortality in the study area? And furthermore, important information....
2. Study design...institution-based. Please correct this.
3. "The source populations were all mothers with infants attending PNC and immunization clinics at Debre Tabor Comprehensive Specialized Hospital." Please revise it as "The source population was all mothers attending PNC and immunization clinics at Debre Tabor Comprehensive Specialized Hospital."
4. DTCSH: please describe this abbreviation and express it within brackets.
5. (Those mothers with infants who were not willing to participate in the study.) They are non-respondents. Don't count them in the exclusion criteria. If you did so, you took a wrong way.
6. What does "mentally incompetent" mean??? Do you think this term is an appropriate expression??...unethical expression.
7. Your study had two outcome variables (knowledge and practice). However, your sample size determination approach is for a single outcome, either knowledge or practice. That is a wrong and unacceptable way of determining the sample size.....If you followed any acceptable approach, please try to include it in your revised version.
8. What is your rationale behind using the reduction formula and again adding a 10% non-response rate?
9. Your Sampling procedure is not well written and is less informative about the way of participant selection. Please rewrite this section in detail. Remove unnecessary wordings like "interviewed." An interview is for non-probability sampling.
10. "Knowledge about sunlight exposure": replace with knowledge towards infant sunlight exposure. "Practice of sunlight exposure": better to say infant sunlight exposure practice.
11. Please provide references for your operational definitions.
12. The structured questionnaire was designed by reviewing different literature... please cite the literature that you used to develop your questionnaire.
13. In your abstract section, your data collectors were 5 BSc midwives, whereas the method and materials section of the main text tells us that this study's data collectors were 3 BSc Nurses and 2 Midwives???? Inconsistent information. Overall, your data collection procedure and tools section is not well written. Please add detailed information in a more informative way.

Results

1. Where are the 95% CIs for your outcome variables (knowledge and practice)? Please add the 95% CIs unless a simple proportion is less informative for a scientific society.
2. Multinomial logistic regression? Please edit it.
3. Please interpret your results. You simply put only AORs with their 95% CIs. Interpretation of the results is an important part of this manuscript. Therefore, consider a single paragraph that indicates the interpretation of your findings,

especially in the factor analysis results.

4. Be sure that your tables are prepared according to the journal's guidelines.

Discussion

1. The significance of your study should be mentioned at the beginning of the discussion, and then you should put forth a paragraph of your study findings. After that, you can continue by making comparisons with previous research works. I think your manuscript missed this approach. I recommend that it would be better if you read about how to write a discussion for a scientific paper.
2. Your discussion is poor. Each and every associated factor should be discussed in detail. It needs extensive work to make your discussion attractive again for publication in a scientific journal.
3. I have no time to express myself regarding your discussion section in depth. Please google and read about how to write a strong discussion in a scientific paper and/or contact somebody nearby who has better exposure to scientific paper writing.

General comments

1. Your research work is scientifically sound and in a researchable area. However, it needs extensive editing and language correction. It lacks consistency. It didn't acknowledge the origin of ideas and sentences. The Methods and Materials, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion sections of this manuscript have been poorly written.