

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

Addisu Andualem Ferede¹

¹ Debre Markos University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Comments to the author

I thank you for reviewing the manuscript entitled "Maternal Misconceptions Against Infant Sunlight Exposure Are Still Bottlenecks in Northwest Ethiopia, by 2022". The presented title is important to the scientific community for assessing knowledge and practices regarding the exposure of infants to sunlight. However, mothers get information about sunlight exposure immediately after birth, during the immunization period, and postnatal period. It would have been better to conduct this study in the community to assess their knowledge and practices and to obtain reliable data. It needs strong justification why this study was conducted at the institution. The way the manuscript was written should be revised. I suggest the author see the published papers. The whole manuscript should be revised for punctuation and grammar. The model you used to analyze the data is another serious issue. I do not think it is multinomial.

Specific comments are listed below.

Abstract

Background: It is better to make it short and precise.

Methods: What does it mean by patient interviews? Detailed things like the number of participants in the pretest, the number of data collectors, and ... are not necessary in the abstract.

Results: Mother's age, mother's educational status, marital status, and family size were the factors associated with sunlight exposure in multinomial logistic regression. For what outcome variable (knowledge/practice) are they associated? Are you sure that multinomial logistic regression is used? I think it is meant to be multivariable. Corrections should be made throughout the document.

Conclusion and Recommendations: The author concluded that participants did not have good knowledge and practice. However, they scored 67.5% and 62.1% for knowledge and practice, respectively. What is the background to say poor or good? When can we say participants had good knowledge and practice? Is there any national data for it?

Keywords: It is better to write them in alphabetical order. Do you think the terms in the keywords are enough for readers to search and read the paper? Some important terms like knowledge, practice, and... should be included. Please revise it

Background

What is the author's interest in discussing? Good knowledge or poor knowledge; good practice or poor practice? Make it consistent throughout the document.

It is not clear from this statement: Another study conducted in Debre Markos and Dejen District, Amhara Region, Northwest Ethiopia, found that 433 (50%) had a poor knowledge status regarding infant sunlight exposure. Is it one study?

The author puts one sentence as a paragraph. Modifications to the writing style of the background are needed. All the specific categorical associated factors presented in the background should be described. For instance, A study carried out in Debre Markos Town, Ethiopia, found that there was a significant association between maternal age, maternal education, family size, husband's educational status, and knowledge about sunlight exposure. Which age, education, and so on categories?

It is also better to add the factors affecting the practice of sunlight exposure.

Methods and materials

Study area: It is better to add more information about the services of the hospital since it is an institution-based study. More description about the postnatal ward and immunization is also needed.

Remove 's' from populations

Exclusion criteria: Do you think mothers with infants who were not willing to participate in the study is the exclusion criterion? It is a non-response rate.

Give space for 'was 376'

Sampling procedure: The mothers may come for PNC or immunization services. How can you handle it when mothers visit the ward more than once? What is the total number of mothers?

Operational definition: It is better to add references. Don't you think misconception is operationalized?

Data Collection Tools and Procedure: I am confused by this part. The author used different literature to develop the questionnaire. Here, reference citation is needed. Merge the sentences into one paragraph. What does 'standard checklist' mean? I think it contradicts the first sentence. Talking about consent has its own section. Remove it from this and put it in the ethical section.

In the abstract, it says that the data was collected by five BSc midwives. Here, three nurses and two midwives who were working at the immunization center were considered as data collectors. Please make the data collectors consistent.

One of the components of counseling in the selected wards is sunlight exposure. It is their routine activity. Why did you use professionals assigned to the MCH services? What mechanism was used to minimize bias if the data collectors were workers in that ward? When did the actual data collection time start? How can you control information contamination?

Data quality assurance: What have the senior staff done in terms of face validity? What makes face validity differ from content validity?

Does the study have a supervisor? What about training for data collectors? Do you think the data will be assured by only the listed things?

Results: please avoid the scattering of sentences. Merge sentences based on thereby concepts instead of standing alone.

Discussion: How will the readers understand whether the present finding is lower or higher than the previous studies? It needs CI for both knowledge (67.5%, CI -----) and practice (62.1%, CI-----) findings.

Concerning the factors associated with sunlight exposure of mothers, mother's age, mother's educational status, marital status, and family size were the factors associated with sunlight exposure. For which outcome are they associated? For instance, age might or might not be statistically significant for knowledge and/ or practice. It needs re-analysis. Factors associated with knowledge and factors associated with the practice of sunlight exposure should be written separately.

Conclusion and Recommendations: What makes it different from the abstract part? It looks identical. Better to revise it.

The author put health education as an important method to enhance knowledge and practice. However, the conclusion should be from the problems (age, mother's educational status, marital status, and family size) you have identified. Let me explain it more to support this idea. Integrating into the midwifery care process might increase the knowledge and practice of mothers towards sunlight exposure. This sentence is out of the study, so it should not be a conclusion. In general, a number of methods related to sunlight exposure should not be used to conclude the study.

The best researchers knew the limitations of their studies. The study lacks this. Consider it.

Competing Interests, The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Avoid unnecessary s since the author is one.

Ethical consideration needs a reference number.

Finally, I suggest a major revision.