



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_44461
Title of the Manuscript:	TRENDS IN BREASTFEEDING PRACTICES AMONG WOMEN OF CHILDBEARING AGE IN NIGERIA: (A REVIEW OF NATIONAL DEMOGRAPHIC HEALTH SURVEY 1999, 2003, 2008)
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	Abstract Authors' last sentence at the background section is incomplete (....identifies factors associated with...?). The conclusion section at the abstract looks more like recommendations. It should be rewritten to highlight key research findings. Method The word methodology should be changed to method. The method used in this study is poorly described and quite confusing. The authors should have this section rewritten to present a clear description of how they conducted the study. Discussion The authors should compare their results with results obtained in other developing countries as well as developed nations. Conclusion This should be rewritten. What is the conclusion of your study i.e. what were your major findings? Line 468- The word 'commencement' should be used in place of 'onset'. i.e.Ethical approval was obtained before commencement of the study.	Abstract Last sentence at the background section has been completed (...with the pattern over the years. (1999, 2003, 2008)) The conclusion section at the abstract has been rewritten to highlight key research findings. Method The word methodology has been changed to method The method section has been rewritten to present a clear description of how the study was conducted Discussion The results of the study had previously been compared with results from other countries. Conclusion The conclusion has been corrected to highlight the major findings Previous Line 468 now Line 458 – The word 'onset' has been replaced with 'commencement'
Minor REVISION comments	Authors should proof read the work and correct the errors.	The work has been proof read and errors have been corrected.
Optional/General comments	Good study, however, the method used is not properly described.	The method used has been properly described

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) Ethical approval was obtained as reported by the authors.	Approval from NDHS has been attached as a text document on Line 459