

Review of: "Nutritional Status and Dietary Patterns of Children Aged Ten Years and Below In the Buea Municipality, South West Region Cameroon"

K. C. Dirghayu

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Comments

In my opinion, researchers have done a great job by performing community based cross-sectional study with very high methodological thoroughness. The study's research is quite unique, and much needed in today's context of Cameroon whereby severe paucity of evidence in nutrition still persist. I believe this study is certain to add evidence in the field of nutrition in fragile contexts and definitely is likely to support in policy adaptation. Evidences generated from this study will definitely help improvise the program modality and hence work on achieving its target of building resilient in such rural and deprived communities.

Overall, the manuscript is very well organized and presented. Results concluded are clear, concise, and relevant. However, I have some minor as well as some major comments to be addressed first, prior accepting this paper for publication. I also have one comments for the journal team of Qeios. I am uncertain about the formatting guidelines/requirements of the journal, I couldn't see the line number of this manuscript which prevented me to provide specific comments based on the exact presentation of this manuscript. I suggest journal to make it mandatory to submit manuscript with line number which allows reviewers to present their specific comments.

Once authors perform the recommended task, I would like to be of further assistance to improve the quality of this manuscript.

Minor comments:

1. In the materials and methods section of abstract, authors have mentioned the use of self-administered questionnaire was used for the data collection procedure, however, self is mentioned twice there. I suggest authors to recheck this section.
2. Also in the materials and methodology authors have mentioned the use of semi-structured questionnaire for the purpose of data collection. However, in the main body of the manuscript in the methods section, it is mentioned that authors used structured questionnaire. I want authors to reconfirm this and if authors has adopted semi-structured questionnaire, I suggest authors to highlight the semi-structured version of the questionnaire.
3. In the result section of the abstract, there is a mention of 79 without giving contextual background. I suggest authors to highlight the context first and present the results as it will help lay readers to go through the text and understand as it

moves forward.

4. The third sentence in the result section in abstract is too complex and hard to understand. Also, the result authors trying to convey is unclear both in terms of language and context.
5. Conclusion in the abstract section should be accompanied with a policy recommendation.
6. Data access: Where is the data for this study made available?

Major Comments:

The presentation of the study design, results and discussion while mostly defensible have not been adequately presented as such. My suggestion is that a full and detailed revision be completed prior to consideration for publication. I hope the comments provided below may provide some helpful input on how to possibly clarify the detailing of the study and results for a reader.

General

1. There are issues of grammatical errors and language clarity throughout the manuscript. I think this paper would benefit from an editorial review for its grammatical and language clarity.
2. Would be very careful about using causal language in a cross-sectional paper of non-representative population.
3. Use of complex sentences is often observed throughout the manuscript, I would suggest authors to prioritize use of simple sentences.

Specific

1. Third paragraph in the introduction section is too messy and unorganized. I suggest authors to slowly move down the introduction section, breakdown into smaller context while keeping consideration of the standard presentation of scientific writings.
2. Methods: Why did the authors decide on conducting study on that particular study site given the interest in rural areas that might be best studied elsewhere in the country? Please provide clearly the primary sampling unit and detail the systematic random sampling method more elaborately. What are quantitative techniques? Please provide explanation of the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study and who specifically in the household was interviewed (if household head provide definition of household head).
3. What theoretical or conceptual underpinning did the authors have to include the factors they did in the analysis? Please clarify
4. Results presented were not satisfactory. Lack of directionality in presenting results is commonly observed. I suggest authors to reassess the result section and present accordingly.
5. Lack of evidence based discussion is clearly visible. I would suggest authors to restructure their overall discussion section based on their findings only and supported by relevant evidence.
6. I don't think this is a representative sample of a typical rural area in Cameroon- if the authors disagree, would urge them to present their argument of why clearly when they describe the strengths of the study.
7. Last paragraph of discussion relates the finding from this study with one study conducted in similar context. I suggest

authors to focus on supporting their findings with some more evidence whether they have positive or negative association. This should be the case for all the discussion section as most of them lack the support from their similar or contrasting findings.

8. I suggest authors to present the strengths and limitations of this study, as it is completely missing from the presented manuscript. Also, this manuscript lacks abbreviations used, authors contribution, and acknowledgement section which provides reviewers with the detailed insight of the manuscript and the researchers who completed this study.