

Peer Review

Review of: "Early Childhood Caregiver Practices and Perceptions Regarding Sharenting and its Impact"

Abhishek Lal¹

1. Aga Khan University, Pakistan

Title: The title has some language used such as "impact," which is more likely used to establish causality, which is not within the scope of cross-sectional studies. Secondly, the word "perception" is more suited for qualitative studies than for quantitative studies. I would suggest revising it.

Abstract:

The overall abstract needs rephrasing, as the scientific language format should be followed, ensuring crisp and concise language.

The abstract seems confusing, as it gives the impression of a qualitative study; however, the study design mentioned is quantitative.

Introduction:

Epidemiological data in the introduction section should be concise, as elaborating more on it does not add any useful information for the readers. Readers interested can always refer to the cited paper for further information. I would suggest making it crisp and concise.

The heading of "literature review" should be incorporated within the body of the introduction, not as a separate heading. Please consider merging it. Focus more on the study location of your study rather than elaborating more on global and regional statistics.

When talking about the gaps in the literature, the flow should be proper, as listing gaps in a numeric form is not very scientific. The research gap should focus on why this research is important and why it needs to be conducted. What gap will your research try to address?

Objectives:

There is no need to repeat the rationale of the study when writing the objectives.

The first objective seems to be in qualitative terms.

For quantitative studies, terminologies like “to determine,” “to identify,” and “to assess” are used. Please consider rephrasing your objectives to focus on what your study is trying to measure and assess.

Methodology:

Is this a descriptive or analytical cross-sectional study?

You have mentioned in the objectives the motivation and impact of sharenting, which suggests attempting to establish causality. However, the study design chosen in this study cannot establish that. So, how can this statement be justified as written in the paper “ensuring the current data and perspective of the people without change of time-based differences”?

How was the sample size calculated for this study?

Is the data collection tool that is used validated for the study population of your study?

Only descriptive statistics were performed? Why not inferential statistics? No association can be determined without it.

Results:

The sample of participants, i.e., the males to females ratio, is quite small. This is likely to have an effect on the study results.

Consider rephrasing all the captions of the tables.

Discussion:

As a strength, you have mentioned this to be a robust study; however, the sample size is very small. So, robustness cannot be achieved.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.