

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJTDH_111383 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | KNOWLEDGE AND PERCEPTION OF FEEDING STIMULATORS AMONG NURSING MOTHERS WITH INFANTS AND TODDLERS AGED 6 TO 24 MONTHS IN OLUYOLE LOCAL GOVERNMENT, IBADAN, OYO STATE, NIGERIA |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

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) |
|--|--|--|
| <p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>Feeding stimulators is a concept with unknown ideas with new innovations from different mothers.</p> <p>appropriate comprehensive. But key words can be re-arranged</p> <p>appropriate</p> <p>correct</p> <p>yes</p> | <p>The keywords have been rearranged from “knowledge, perception, feeding stimulators, nursing mother, children” to “knowledge, perception, nursing mother, infants&toddlers, feeding stimulators”</p> |
| <p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>suitable</p> | |
| <p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p> | <p>Minimal sample size calculated for the study is 410. But for the study they have considered 400. Kindly justify</p> | <p>The extra 10 that should have been in the study were expunged during data analysis due to missing information key to the research. This was stated un the manuscript under the methods section.</p> |

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? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |