



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_35704
Title of the Manuscript:	Home Management of Childhood diarrhoea: A survey of mothers in Uyo, Southern 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>)



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Introduction Good but too long, write following your research questions start with global view then keen narrowing till to your country Methods I suggest that you show how you derived your sample size Line 200: a reader would wish to know the kind of measures undertaken Results You did not analyze your data, you have almost raw data. Line 204: you said that a prior level of significance $P < 0.05$ was used for all comparisons but I do not see any comparison done! What is the significance level for example among the different ages? Is there any significant difference amongst the married, single and separated? Show the P values. Table 2: what is "poor knowledge" how did you derive to that? In other words what was your base line to say high, average and poor knowledge? For all tables; column title is confusing, it needs editing. You may actual need to present number and frequency only, I think... Conclusion Line 446, which medical condition? Line 452 and 453, how did you conclude that there was no significant relationship without statistical..... Rewrite your conclusion telling us what you found, how and why your findings were like that. References Your references are not consistent, this journal has a standard you need to follow this is very important. Try and use a reference manager please e.g. you could use Mendeley. Journal names are written in italics, some where you write 'WHO' elsewhere 'world health organization' which one is which?	The authors have noted with thanks the reviewer's comments on the introduction, methods, results, conclusion and references. we shall effect the recommendation.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		