

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

Alfred Maluwa¹

¹ Malawi University of Science and Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review results of the manuscript entitled “Maternal Misconceptions Against Infant Sunlight Exposure Are Still Bottlenecks in Northwest Ethiopia, by 2022.”

By Professor Alfred Maluwa

Comments

This is a good study that investigated knowledge, practices, and factors affecting the sunlight exposure of infants among women attending Debre Tabor Comprehensive Specialized Hospital in Ethiopia. The manuscript is fairly prepared but could be strengthened as follows;

1: Topic – The topic and the study focus are different. The topic talks about maternal misconceptions... while the study has dealt with maternal characteristics or factors determining sunlight exposure of babies. This needs to be corrected.

2: The study design is cross-sectional, but the statement should be strengthened by also indicating that it followed the “quantitative research paradigm.”

3: On the results and the associated conclusion, overall knowledge was 77.8%, and 73% of the women practiced daily; and 67.5% and 62.1% had knowledge and practiced, respectively. However, the authors conclude that there was no good knowledge and practice

among the women. I think there is a need to clarify what constitutes “good” in this study; otherwise, there was moderate knowledge and practice as the figures were 60% and higher.

4: The background section is characterized by short paragraphs; sometimes a single sentence constitutes a paragraph. This section needs to be re-written and use appropriate conjunctions to make the English flow in a number of sentences within a paragraph.

5: When reporting the factors associated with sunlight exposure, AOR and CI are reported but without their associated P-levels. In addition, although the test level of significance is 5%, in Table 4, different levels are shown by stars ** or *** but there is no key to explain these test levels of significance.

6: The discussions on the results of 62.8%, 50%, 50.1%, and 60.0% could have been explained better if a comparison test was undertaken; by inspection, I think 62.8% and 60.0% may not be significantly different from each other. Similarly, 50% and 50.1% may not be significantly different from each other. Of course, my observations depend upon the standard errors that are associated with these figures, which have not been reported in the results.

7: Conclusion

I think knowledge and practice levels were moderate to good in this study. However, the scoring should be well explained in the methodology if indeed those figures represent “not good” levels.