



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_47467
Title of the Manuscript:	Prelacteal Feeding Practices Of Mothers Attending Infant Welfare Clinic In A Tertiary Hospital In Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The theme dealt here is important. I have some advice.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The mothers were asked NOT during the stay in the hospital after birth (postpartum stay in the hospital) BUT at the time of hospital visit for immunization etc, right? Why did you NOT employ the former? The latter naturally leads to recall bias. Since the breastfeeding usually begins within 1 day after birth, questionnaire should be made during hospital stay after birth. If this was impossible for some reason, telephone interview or 1-month postnatal visit may be a second better chance. Please explain why you DID not ask women at these timings. The first breastfeed and prelacteal feeds has "relationship", you state. Readers cannot understand the meaning. Relationship (association) has two meaning: positive or negative. Please express this relation using word, for example, the earlier, the lower, etc. Make the readers to grasp the meaning without obliging readers to closely look at Tables. State things much more simply. You later state, "Babies born outside the UPTH were more likely to receive prelacteal feeds.", which is very easy to understand. I mean that you had better employ this kind of expression everywhere. Nobody is interested in whether it has "statistical significance" but everybody is interested in what prevents breastfeeding. 2. Discussion line 7: what is "kkk"? 3. Conclusion: Delete the sentence of "The practice of prelacteal feeding is common" because breastfeeding is more common than prelacteal feeding. If you wish to write it, indicate direct percentage that you showed here. 4. Reference is awkward. For example, 122-128 vs. 122-8; two patterns coexist. In some, 2018; 24 Feb (2): 122-28 and some 2018; 24: 122-28. You had better use Endnote or "copy and paste" PubMed and then trim it. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Shigeki Matsubara
Department, University & Country	Jichi Medical University, Japan