



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_22830
Title of the Manuscript:	Breastfeeding and Association with Diarrheal Diseases: A Tale of two Councils in South-Eastern Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Original research Articles

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	1. The author's should include a sub-title on sample size and it's method of calculation. 2. Full colons at end of each sub-heading should be deleted. 3. Ethical clearance Number by the clearance body should be indicate.	Dear Reviewer, we thank you for your thorough review and bright suggestions. We have tried to address the issues raised. 1. Subtitle on sample size included (now with study participants) line 81. We have described this section in lines 84 to 86 but did not include the mathematical calculation there. Below is how we arrived at our sample size The minimum sample was calculated using the formula $N = \frac{z^2 PQ}{d^2}$ Where N =minimum sample size Z=1.96 at 95% confidence limit d = margin error usually 0.05 P= prevalence Q= 1-P Using prevalence (P) of 8.16% from the UNICEF's "Situation analysis of children and women in Nigeria: 2011 update" published in 2012 thus $N = \frac{1.96^2(0.087)(1-0.087)}{(0.05)^2}$ $= \frac{3.8416(0.087)(0.913)}{0.0025}$ $= 122$ Therefore the minimum sample size was 122 infants. Using an attrition rate of 10%, this was brought up to 140 infants and later increased to 200 to increase the statistical power. 2. Semicolons deleted 3. The Hospital's ethical committee does not give clearance



SDI Review Form 1.6

		number in our institution
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Table 3 at the appendix should be plain as others for uniformity. 2. The study respondents should be clear line no: 111-112. 3. At the conclusion section the author's should include the need for a clinical trial on extensive breed-feeding to ascertain their claims. Ethical issue: Because we do not have an acknowledgement statement on source of funding for the study and also for people who contributed directly and indirectly to the study.	1. Table three reformatted. Line 277 2. This has been corrected too. See line 88 3. Added. See line 197 to 198
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	These kinds of studies are very interesting for they are involving the new-borns who are the backbone of the future generation. Consequently, the need for extensive breed-feeding for the first six months of an infant's should be widely encouraged by involving various policy bodies of the today's governments. However, this manuscript requires corrections on grammatical errors.	