

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJTDH_114505</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>ASSESSMENT OF PREVELANCE AND DETERMINANTS OF EXCLUSIVE BREASTFEEDING AMONG MOTHERS WITH INFANTS AGED UNDER SIX MONTHS IN WADAJIR DISTRICT, BANADIR REGION- SOMALIA</b>
Type of the Article	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p><b>Abstract:</b> The introduction should provide fundamental information on Exclusive Breastfeeding, covering its current prevalence globally and regionally, including Somalia. It should delve into the existing knowledge and determinants, emphasizing the reduction in mortality risk or odds. Additionally, highlight Somalia's efforts to address Exclusive Breastfeeding challenges. The introduction should explicitly state the research gap. Ensure the word "knowledge" is added to the title since it is included in the abstract's objectives.</p> <p>Since this study naturally its a mixed study, thoroughly elaborate on how qualitative data were collected and analyzed. Clarify the procedures for collecting and analyzing quantitative data. Specify the approach used for multiple analyses.</p> <p>For the results section, revise it by excluding non-significant determinants. Specify the level of statistical significance set for this study. Remove the statement, "Because of having frequent and close pregnancy outweigh EBF and overall breastfeeding, and infant care," as it appears unclear and may be misleading. Please revise the entire conclusion to align more accurately with the findings.</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> The introduction is satisfactory, but certain revisions are necessary. The existing gap remains unaddressed, and there's a need to emphasize what is unknown specifically in that district. Additionally, it is crucial to explore the determinants at the national level and justify any anticipated differences from your study. Provide information on when the WHO-recommended implementation started in Somalia, examine the trend of exclusive breastfeeding since then, and establish its relevance to your specific district. Remove sections such as the problem statement, justification, rationale, objectives, delimitation, assumption, hypothesis, and scope of the study. Place the study limitations after the discussion and conclusion sections.</p> <p><b>Methods:</b> The sampling methodology must provide a precise account of the selection process. Clarify the term "Sound Mind" in the inclusion criteria. Additionally, explain the rationale for selecting mothers with infants under 6 months and ensure that exclusion criteria is not the opposite of the inclusion criteria but rather the reason why a participant was not selected. Remove sections on consenting, research instruments (incorporate it into the collection procedure), and validity and reliability of the data. Completely revise the data analysis section, specifying the type of analysis used for each objective. Clearly document how the qualitative and quantitative components were analyzed. The ethical clearance section lacks clarity and requires a thorough revision</p> <p><b>Results and discussion</b> should be separated into distinct sections. The author has not effectively interpreted the results, leading to a lack of clarity in the overall findings. Tables for demographic characteristics and determinants of Exclusive Breastfeeding are recommended, but the current ones taken from SPSS output require editing according to standard guidelines for research tables. The overall organization of the results lacks clarity. According to the methodology, the significance level is set at &lt;0.05. However, associations beyond 0.05 have been included as significant, which is not correct.</p> <p>The recommendations and conclusion do not align with the findings, necessitating a rewrite to better reflect the study result. This should be carried out after a thorough analysis is repeated, providing clear findings and engaging in a comprehensive discussion that includes valid comparisons and differences</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	<b>Hans Maro</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College, Tanzania</b>