

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

Gelareh Biazar¹

¹ Guilan University of Medical Sciences

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear EIC, thank you for your kind invitation.

I have reviewed the paper; following are my comments. In my opinion, it is rejected.

The abstract is not well designed; the introduction section should be summarized, and the result section should be mentioned with more details.

Keywords should be revised based on the Mesh system.

In the introduction section, the necessity of this work is not mentioned,

In the method section, it is not necessary to provide details about the geographical features of the city where the study was conducted.

The abbreviations should be completely written out for the study.

Who completed the questionnaires? And the way, via a direct interview?

Please note the process of sampling? How many mothers were interviewed?

How many people did not meet the inclusion criteria, and what were the reasons ?

Is the questionnaire researcher-made? How was the validity and reliability of the questionnaire confirmed? Content Validity Ratio (CVR), Content Validity Index (CVI), and alpha Cronbach values should be presented, and the way they were calculated as well.

Please explain the 100% response rate , how it was achieved, because almost all the time, at least a rejection rate is expected.

The questionnaire is not qualified because it does not address the risks of unplanned sunlight exposure in terms of the time, duration, and protection, especially direct and prolonged exposure. In fact, adequate and correct information is not added to maternal knowledge.

Finally, the manuscript is prepared based on several old references and with many writing and grammatical defects.

Warm regards,

Gelareh Biazar, MD