

Review of: "Risk Factors and Predictors of Severe Acute Malnutrition Among 6-59 Months Children in Lumbini Province, Nepal: A Facility-Based Cross-Sectional Study"

Alemayehu Bayray¹

¹ Mekelle University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The authors have selected an important area where there is no much information. The way the manuscript is written in an acceptable form. Moreover, I have some minor comments and suggestions that would help improve the manuscript for the readers. Here are my suggestions:

1. the title: Risk factors and predictors are usually used interchangeably. Therefore, it is advisable to change the title in to the following manner: ***Prevalence and risk factors of Severe Acute Malnutrition Among 6-59 Months Children in Lumbini Province, Nepal: A Facility-Based Cross-Sectional Study***
 2. I have seen that the authors were using more passive voices that active voices across the manuscript. I suggest the authors to use more active voice so as to make a coherence in the flow of the manuscript and make it live. for example, instead of of saying " *The study concludes that it's better to write it "We conclude that..."*
 3. The Study design: a facility based descriptive cross sectional study only refers to the description of the results in percentage, mean, mode, median , standard deviations... its just for studies that does not use advanced statistical analysis. Therefore, since the authors used inferential statistics the word descriptive should have to be removed.
- Method of analysis: model fitness test "Hosmer and Lemeshow test is mandatory, in addition to the multi-collinearity tests. It's also good if you indicate the variable selection method that you have used in the regression analysis.
4. This should have to be the conclusion in addition to the prevalence of SAM, the others are not significant after adjustment (child's age and mother's age at childbirth were observed as significant predictors of SAM.)
 5. The use of risk factors and predictors separately is not appropriate. Use either of them. And please consider only those found statistically significant after adjustment (aOR).