

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_104506
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional status and Existing early childhood feeding practice of under five children: A cross-sectional study in Rural Bangladesh
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.journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5.</p> <p>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes it is important for scientific community</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes all are recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>The paper is very interesting but the author needs to do a major revision</p> <p>Sections: Methods</p> <p>1. Author needs to give the sample size formula in the sample size procedure section. 2. Author needs to give details of logistic regression equations.</p> <p>3. Which variables have you taken as Independent? Please define the number of independent variables in the study. It is better to add another heading for the Independents variable.</p> <p>Results</p> <p>1. Authors interpret "the risk of a child being underweight was 0.29 (AOR: 0.29, 95% CI: 0.08, 0.94) times higher among children who were <6 months of age than children who were aged 24 months". That is the wrong interpretation. In table-2 found it was lower risk than the child>24 months. So authors should write child being <0.6 months, had 0.29 times lower risk or reduced 71% risk of child underweight than >24 months.</p> <p>2. In the results sections author says no strong association between nutritional status with the father's occupation, family size. While in the discussion sections, author written the father's occupation and family income have strongly associated with a child being underweight. Please write one-way results not bi-directional.</p> <p>3. Author explained father's education is not significantly associated with child nutrition while the father's occupation has significant. My question is that education and occupation not going in a parallel direction.</p> <p>4. Furthermore in Table-2 I have not found any significant value of the father occupation for their</p>	

	<p>child underweight or other measures.</p> <p>5. In table -1 Exclusive breastfeeding (under 6 months) and Continued breastfeeding at 1 year (12-15 months age) total sample was (38+29= 67) what about the other mothers? In my convenient, it is better to recode Breastfeeding practices or duration of Breastfeeding (Exclusive breastfeeding (under 6 months), 6-12 months, and 12-15 months).</p> <p>6. Author include 404 children in the study, But in the table-1 the prevalence of stunting, wasting, and being underweight were found at 401, 370, and 393. What about reaming children?</p> <p>7. Author written, stunting and wasting were not found significantly associated with any of these. Can Please explain why not associated? Give the earlier evidence.</p> <p>8. In my convenience author should add one more table for the prevalence of child malnutrition (stunting, wasting, and underweight) with their background characteristics.</p> <p>9. Limitation of the study need to add in the manuscript.</p> <p>10. In reference category variables its better indicate symbol „®“ as superscript instead of [R].</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Thank you for your submission. I have thoroughly read your manuscript and I found that you need to do some improvements.</p> <p>The paper is very interesting but the author needs to do a major revision</p> <p>Sections: Methods</p> <p>1. Author needs to give the sample size formula in the sample size procedure section. 2. Author needs to give details of logistic regression equations.</p> <p>3. Which variables have you taken as Independent? Please define the number of independent variables in the study. It is better to add another heading for the Independents variable.</p> <p>Results</p> <p>1. Authors interpret “the risk of a child being underweight was 0.29 (AOR: 0.29, 95% CI: 0.08, 0.94) times higher among children who were <6 months of age than children who were aged 24 months”. That is the wrong interpretation. In table-2 found it was lower risk than the child>24 months. So authors should write child being <0.6 months, had 0.29 times lower risk or reduced 71% risk of child underweight than >24 months.</p> <p>2. In the results sections author says no strong association between nutritional status with the father's occupation, family size. While in the discussion sections, author written the father's occupation and family income have strongly associated with a child being underweight. Please</p>	

	<p>write one-way results not bi-directional.</p> <p>3. Author explained father's education is not significantly associated with child nutrition while the father's occupation has significant. My question is that education and occupation not going in a parallel direction.</p> <p>4. Furthermore in Table-2 I have not found any significant value of the father occupation for their child underweight or other measures.</p> <p>5. In table -1 Exclusive breastfeeding (under 6 months) and Continued breastfeeding at 1 year (12- 15 months age) total sample was (38+29= 67) what about the other mothers? In my convenient, it is better to recode Breastfeeding practices or duration of Breastfeeding (Exclusive breastfeeding (under 6 months), 6-12 months, and 12-15 months).</p> <p>6. Author include 404 children in the study, But in the table-1 the prevalence of stunting, wasting, and being underweight were found at 401, 370, and 393. What about reaming children?</p> <p>7. Author written, stunting and wasting were not found significantly associated with any of these. Can Please explain why not associated? Give the earlier evidence.</p> <p>8. In my convenience author should add one more table for the prevalence of child malnutrition (stunting, wasting, and underweight) with their background characteristics.</p> <p>9. Limitation of the study need to add in the manuscript.</p> <p>10. In reference category variables its better indicate symbol „®“ as superscript instead of [R].</p>	
--	---	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ujjwal Das
Department, University & Country	Fakir Mohan University, India