

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_100084
Title of the Manuscript:	A case control study on the determinants of behavior towards diarrhea in children under five years old
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes. The author aims to present the evidences on prevention of diarrheal diseases among under 5 children. The subject is important and publishing new studies add value. The paper is based upon primary data, hence should be welcomed.</p> <p>2. Yes, it could be amended as "Determinants of hygiene behavior among the mothers and caregivers of children under five years : A case control study on influences of diarrheal diseases from Aceh Province-Indonesia".</p> <p>3. No. The abstract should be strengthened by including more details from findings of the research.</p> <p>4. Broadly yes, but a section on literature review can be added.</p> <p>5. Yes. Observations (data) should be presented in the result section. Figures, charts and graphs should be included as required.</p> <p>6. Several scientific studies published by UNICEF, National Library of Medicine and others are available.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The author's English language is good. But few minor changes in the text that can improve the quality of presentation. For example, the opening line in Abstract use of word "knowledge", which does not give any clue about "what knowledge" has been studied. "Knowledge" itself does not indicate much and one can question the type knowledge, discipline etc. Only later in text, we find "knowledge about diarrhea" that matters for mothers of under 5 children. Therefore, simpler choice such as "hygiene awareness" or "information about the diarrheal risks" can make the presentation lucid and improve the readers experience.</p> <p>The abstract section could be improved with a clear mention of the reference group-such as mothers of children under 5 years. Are other caregivers (part-time) not part of the study?</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Measurement of the three indicators used in the paper should appear more logical. A paragraph explaining how the behaviours that is, "knowledge", "hand-washing" and "toilet use" have been rated as high/low or good/bad would be important. For example, practicing handwashing before meals, handwashing after toilet-use or handwashing after cleaning the child's faeces are considered as "good" hygiene behaviour. Also, hand-washing should be defined as- use of soap and water at critical times. Any absence of these behaviour is considered "bad".</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Uday Shankar Prasad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>