

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

Martina Oneko¹

¹ Kenya Medical Research Institute

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

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

The topic is interesting and of public health importance. The author cited a number of local publications on the same topic and compared the results between different regions of Ethiopia.

To make the manuscript more relevant, here are a few suggestions:

Abstract:

- Results section should show how many mothers were interviewed
- Conclusion: More than half of the mothers interviewed did not have good knowledge, so this conclusion should be more specific. Suggestion: 'About one third of mothers interviewed did not have good knowledge'. Otherwise, it sounds contradicting to the results section.

Background:

Prior to starting with the use of sunlight exposure, it would be good to state the size of the public health problem. How many children are diagnosed with rickets? How many have vitamin D deficiency?

In the questionnaire, harmful effects of sunlight exposure are mentioned. This area could be expanded in the background section, especially as some of the references are referring to harmful effects.

The background section lists a lot of studies where practices were assessed. It would have been good to describe the traditional practice. In some parts of Africa, newborns are not allowed to be taken out of the house for 45 days, while in other parts, there are no regulations. I suggest summarizing the local findings in one paragraph rather than listing the similar findings in different parts of Ethiopia.

Several suggestions about rewording the text are attached as comments.

Methods:

The method section is split into too many headers and paragraphs. This should be consolidated, and not all sections are necessary. The method section is also almost identical to the methods described in the publication by Halleyesus Gedamu (reference 20). I suggest summarizing the methods with a maximum of 3-4 paragraphs/different headers.

Results:

The results section should be expanded, giving a more detailed interpretation of the results shown in the subsequent tables. Especially the paragraph 'Factors associated with sunlight exposure' is not easy to read. AOR and COR are not explained anywhere. A more narrative explanation of the findings would be helpful (like: mothers of xx age were xx times more/less likely to expose their children to sunlight).

Tables: Tables 1 to 3 are self-explanatory, even though some headers should be changed (language).

Example: Table 3:

- 'Frequently do you expose' should be changed to 'How frequently do you expose'
- 'Things do you apply' should be changed to 'What do you apply'.

Table 4 is not clear: Is the first variable = 1? Why? Where do the asterisks belong? Explain AOR and COR.

Discussion and CONCLUSION: The discussion section talks of good knowledge and good practice in more than half of the mothers interviewed, and this is compared to other local studies. But then the conclusion section contradicts this finding by saying there is no good knowledge and practice.

It would be better to say: In spite of dissemination of knowledge about the benefits of exposure to sunlight to treat neonatal jaundice and for better bone health, only about two thirds of mothers show good knowledge and only about xx% practice sunlight exposure adequately. Therefore, health education is still important....

References

The reference section needs some attention. At least 1 citation has the wrong year of publication:

Example:

Reference 1 cited as: ^Harrison, S. L., Buettner, P. G., & MacLennan, R. (2002). *Why do mothers still sun their infants? Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health*, 38(3), 296-299.

S L Harrison 1, P G Buettner, R MacLennan, Why do mothers still sun their infants?

J Paediatr Child Health. 1999 Jun;35(3):296-9. doi: 10.1046/j.1440-1754.1999.00362.x

At least 1 reference seems to have been cited in the wrong part of the text: Reference 10 is mentioned after paragraph 3 of the Background section, yet reference 10 is related to a hospital in Addis Ababa, while the publications about Debre Markos and Dejen are references 18 and 19.

I suggest this manuscript should undergo some major revisions.

I have uploaded the commented-on manuscript as supplementary data.