



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_42974
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge and attitude of Nigerian health workers in practice of Kangaroo Mother Care
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"	A paper (Onubogu UC, Okoh BA. Implementation of Kangaroo Mother Care by health workers in Nigeria. Niger J Paediatr 2016; 43(4) : 252-257)has been found that obtained data at the same conference with some difference in the questions. The Onubogu work should be referenced because it is about a similar subject and probably the same sample (Table 2 of Onubogu is the same as Table 1 of this paper under review); also some justification on why a different approach was needed for writing this paper under review. There is inconsistency in the number of questions regarding attitude (in line 92 of the manuscript it mentions 8 questions while in line 95 and in Table 2 there are 7 attitude questions; which one is correct?) In Table 2 there are 8 knowledge questions while in line 92 of the manuscript, 10 knowledge questions are mentioned.	The paper has been referenced and highlighted in yellow. As at the time the present paper was written, the Onubogu paper was still under review and therefore not able to be referenced. The present study is a nested study of the earlier one that determined implementation of KMC among health care workers. Corrected to 7 please. The first 2 questions have been added. They were left out initially as they really didn't objectively assess knowledge but perception of knowledge.
Minor REVISION comments	The title mentions knowledge and attitudes towards practice of Kangaroo Mother care but the questions in the questionnaire are mostly about the knowledge of benefits with an aim to assess the ability of the healthcare worker to promote and convince parents to initiate the practice. Clinical practice of KMC does not only depend on the personal decision of healthcare workers; the existence of guidelines in the hospitals may be important to adopt KMC practice in healthcare institutions, according to reference [12] by Olsson [12]. Did the authors ask questions about guidelines? The title could be improved. In the introduction, line 43 of manuscript, I suggest to mention the origins of Kangaroo mother care in late 70's in a country that, at that time, probably had healthcare infrastructure challenges like those Nigeria faces today. In the results, the proportion of doctors to nurses that attended the conference may not reflect the proportions found in healthcare institutions. This aspect can be discussed in the discussion section. In the discussion, lines 187 to 192, when mentioning Ludington-Hoe reference [24] regarding intubated infants, the importance of having or not having asked the question about the existence of guidelines in the healthcare facilities of the respondents shows itself. Further research to assess the organizational readiness of hospitals in Nigeria to implement KMC could be recommended. Please correct the last name/first name of authors of reference [11], is should be like this: "Flynn A" instead of Ann F for example. Apparently, this reference is repeated in [22]. Correct this.	The title has been modified. More than half of the institutions represented in the study cohort did not have a written policy as reported by a previous study in the same cohort and this is now highlighted and referenced in the discussion. History added. Highlighted in discussion Noted and recommended Correction done
Optional/General comments		