

Peer Review

Review of: "Simultaneous Wasting and Stunting (WaSt), Wasting and Anaemia (WaAn), and Wasting, Stunting, and Anaemia (WaStAn) Among Children Aged 6–59 Months in Karamoja, Uganda"

Phillips Edomwonyi Obasohan¹

1. Niger State Polytechnic, Zungeru, Nigeria

I have the following observations regarding this paper, particularly on the treatment of undernutrition.

The introduction highlights stunting, wasting, and underweight as the components of undernutrition, but then unexpectedly introduces anaemia while omitting underweight. Why is this approach taken? The sudden mention of anaemia alongside an exclusion of underweight requires more explanation.

While the sampling techniques may be detailed in the main report of the survey, it would be more effective to summarize them briefly in this paper and direct readers to the main report for further details.

Figure 1 lacks detail and includes unnecessary items, such as components reported in the EXCLUSION with zero values. Additionally, the term "Nutrition status" lacks clarity.

The main outcome, WaStAn, has been dichotomised to employ binary logistic regression. The introduction of multinomial logistic regression raises questions about what specific outcome variables this addresses; clarification is needed.

In Table 1, nutritional status appears with four classifications without clear justification. It is unclear where this classification originates.

Furthermore, the components of malnutrition need to be defined. The rationale behind the cross-tabulation of "components against its components," like malnutrition status versus stunting and wasting, also requires further elaboration.

These areas need addressing to ensure clarity and coherence in the paper.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.