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"

Hellen Kinyi[1]

1 Kabale University

General comments

Thanks for doing this work and highlighting risk factors for SAM. I am curious on if all your participants were sick children and their mothers, which was your control group? Were there children admitted in the study sites and are not suffering from Malnutrition?

Abstract

- In the results section of the abstract, risk factors for SAM identified have been outlined (paragraph 2). However, it is not clear whether the association is positive (increased risk with the presence of the factor) or negative (decreased risk with the presence of the factor). This lack of specificity can make it challenging to interpret the findings. I suggest the authors provide a clearer understanding of the associations by including information about the direction and strength of the associations between the factors and SAM.
- It is very hard to make deductions from the concluding section. Use of the words determining factors and predictors of SAM show an association with SAM, but they don't show the direction. Consider adding information about the direction and strength of the associations.

For example: "The child's age and maternal age at childbirth emerged as significant predictors of SAM, with younger children and younger mothers being at higher risk."

Introduction

This section is well written. It gives insight on what is known regarding SAM worldwide and in Nepal and explains why it is important to conduct research in that specific area.

Methodology

This is well written. I enjoyed reading this

Results

There is still a gap here. Presentation of results should include more than just listing the headings or variables that

showed association with SAM. What was the direction, if income was a risk factor, which income, low income or high income? Although this information can be got in the table I suggest you add this aspect to the written section of the results. How is a toilet facility a risk factor of SAM? I think the write wording would be absence of a toilet facility is a risk factor for SAM. Younger children aged 6-11 months had increased risk of SAM compared to their older children aged 24-59 months. (For example)

Discussion

The discussion section explaining association between household size and SAM is inadequate. This section mentions the association but does not explain as to why this association exists and it implications. Could the authors offer a hypothesis as to why households with many members are associated with SAM? How has the economic growth mentioned contributed to size of households and SAM?

Conclusion

Use recommendations suggested above to give direction to the risk factors placed in the conclusion. What is the take home message from this study?