

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_127492
Title of the Manuscript:	EXCLUSIVE BREAST FEEDING PRACTICES, KNOWLEDGE AND CHALLENGES AMONGST MOTHERS WITH CHILDREN 0-6 MONTHS IN THE BAMENDA II MUNICIPALITY OF THE NORTHWEST REGION OF CAMEROON
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses an important public health topic, focusing on exclusive breastfeeding (EBF) practices, knowledge, and barriers among mothers in Cameroon. It contributes to understanding the disconnect between EBF knowledge and practice, providing insights relevant for maternal and child health interventions in similar settings. However, the study's methodology, citation and interpretation of results need refinement to enhance scientific rigor.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear and reflects the study's scope.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract adequately summarizes the study	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure is appropriate, with clearly defined sections for introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. However, better organization is needed within these sections, especially in results and discussion, to avoid repetition and ensure logical flow. Also, limitation of the study should be included	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically relevant as it highlights the low prevalence of EBF despite high levels of awareness, reflecting a critical gap in public health implementation. The use of a cross-sectional design and logistic regression analysis is appropriate for the research objectives. However, limitations in the sampling methodology and insufficient discussion of systemic influences on EBF practices reduce the study's robustness. Strengthening the interpretation of results and addressing methodological gaps will enhance its contribution to the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references are adequate but include some outdated citations. Suggested updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace older WHO references (2014, 2009) with more recent guidelines or reports. • Consider adding regionally specific studies on EBF to strengthen the discussion. 	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript requires substantial editing to improve grammar, eliminate typographical errors, and enhance readability. Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace "good knowledge" and "poor practice" with precise terms (e.g., "high knowledge level" and "low adherence to EBF"). • Use consistent tense throughout the manuscript. 	
Optional/General comments	This study provides valuable data for addressing gaps in EBF practices but falls short in explaining key findings (e.g., why urban mothers practice EBF less despite higher education levels). Incorporating a more in-depth exploration of cultural, economic, and policy factors will enhance its applicability. Additionally, emphasizing actionable recommendations tailored to the study context will strengthen its impact on public health planning.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chidera Gabriel Obi
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria