

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

Aberash Beyene Derribow¹

¹ Wolkite University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I would like to appreciate the authors for their efforts in bringing this issue to the table of discussion. However, the article needs some clarification

1. The author did not provide any justification to conduct this study. This study was conducted in different parts of Ethiopia, even in Debre Tabor town, and is available online. Even the findings and the methods you have used are almost similar. Justification for this question is important. Why did you conduct this research? If you have any justification, please mention.
2. In the Results or abstract section, add OR and CI for all factors.
3. In the conclusion of the abstract section, you said, "According to our study, participants did not have good knowledge and practice." What is your reference to say they did not have good knowledge and practice?
4. The number of words in the abstract is broad. Please conform to the journal's guidelines.

Introduction

1. The introduction section poorly described; it looks like a literature review. The introduction should be clear and short, and please explain why the current review was considered.

Method section

1. Under exclusion criteria, address recall bias: Mothers of infants aged < 1 year attending PNC and immunization clinics at DTCSH during the study period.
2. Your sampling procedure is not clear. Please revise it and make it clear and detailed.
3. How we recruited the final sample and how we calculated the k-value (total number of mothers with their infants by the sample size at the vaccinated clinic). What we mean is that your target population was mothers, not infants. Please revise and correct it.
4. Where is your schematic procedure?
5. Under operational definitions, put a reference.
6. Under the Data Quality Management heading, how did you ensure internal consistency? (test-retest reliability coefficients)

7. For obtaining consent, you mentioned 'written and signed voluntary consent from participants', did you consider their level of literacy? Specify the women's age range, and consider the ethical issues regarding consent.
8. How did you categorize in this way? Do you have any reference? Unable to read & write, Able to read & write, Grade1-6, Grade7-10, Grade11-12, and Certificate and above.
9. Do the conclusions correlate to the results found?

Discussion

1. What results are higher and lower? Put your CIs for both knowledge and practice.
2. In the conclusion, about 67.5% and 62.1% of the mothers had good knowledge and good practice about adequate sunlight exposure, respectively. So, with these values, how can you say participants did not have good knowledge and practice regarding sunlight exposure of infants by what standard?
3. : Editorial review/support is needed throughout the manuscript to correct several punctuations, spelling, capitalization, grammatical/typographical errors, and to enhance writing style sophistication..