



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Mathematics & Computer Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMCS_29302
Title of the Manuscript:	Statistical Analysis of Weight Gain of Children Under-five years in the Kintampo Municipality, Ghana
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	*General comments: -Many language & grammatical errors, needs extensive editing -Reference style in the text should be corrected *Abstract: Results & conclusion are vague & confusing. Feeding, age & parity are significant regarding what? *Introduction: Bad language and wrong reference style. What are the objectives? *Methods: Very defective It is a review for statistical analysis in general The following are missing: -Study duration & dates -study design -sample size calculation & sampling method -Attrition & drop outs rate -Methods of data collection -Ethical consideration Data analysis: write only the program used and methods applied no need for formulae or detailed discussion of the formulae. *Results: -Too long comment on tables -These are output , please present the relevant	Grammatical errors and the reference style have been corrected. *Abstract: Introduction and methods reshaped. Feeding type and parity are significant determinants of weight gain in the Kintampo municipality, highlighted in yellow colour in the abstract. *Introduction: Language and reference style corrected and Modified. The objectives of the study are to determine if there is significant difference in weight gain between male and female children, and to identify significant factors on weight gain of children less than five years. See line 49 to 52. Study duration: The study was carried out between the period of July 2014 to March 2016. This is shown in line 63 to 64 in the text. The study design is a repeated measures case study, indicated in line 68 to 72 with data collection methods. Ethical consideration and study limitations have been discussed in line 284 and 289 respectively.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	information in word tables Table 1: use sex instead of gender Table 2: only weights of 7 months were presented. What about the remaining months up to 5 years? Table 3 is confusing Tables 4&5 delete them. In the methodology write that data are normally distributed as tested by KS test & Shapiro test & found to be normally distributed Nothing was mentioned about birth weight in tables *Discussion: very defective. Just repetition of results with few comments Add study limitations *References: many outdated references *Delete the appendix	The data collected were secondary data of repeated measures of weights of babies. No sampling was done & hence, no sample size calculation or sampling methods needed. We used complete or balanced data, no missing data was included in this study, stated in line 75 to 76 in the text. Table 2: Data were collected on monthly measurements of weights on the children repeatedly for 7 months, repeated measurements of individual children weight was recorded at seven specific time points; weight1, weight2, weight3,... ..., weight7 not 5 years please. This is illustrated in line 78 to 79. Table 3 and birth weight: Table 3 examined the mean birth weight of both males and females and compared it with the standard birth weight of 2.5kg recommended by the world Health Organization. It is found in line 177 to 178. Recent research results have been included in introduction section. These are indicated in line 20 to23 and line 32 to 39 and duly cited in the references, found in lines 310, 333, and 337 Appendix has been deleted.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		