

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Research and Reports in Gynaecology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRGY_86752
Title of the Manuscript:	Early initiation of breastfeeding and Prelacteal Feeding Among Women Attending Postnatal Clinic in the University of Port Harcourt Teaching Hospital.
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:

(<https://www.journalijrrgy.com/index.php/IJRRGY/editorial-policy> )

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>In the abstract ,it was mentioned that only 59 (23.7%) mothers practised early initiation of breast feeding but in table 5 it was mentioned that 16 mothers start feeding less than 1 hour after birth with no prelacteal feeds. In table 4 the numbers of mothers start first session of breast feeding &gt;1hr to 24hr were 178 mothers but in table 5 it were 221 mothers in total ( prelacteal feed Yes and No)The difference number of mothers between these were 43.. Out of 221 only 148 mothers did not give prelacteal feeds to their babies.</p> <p>Questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. How many mothers starting the first session of breast feeding &lt;1 hr? ( reviewer think only 16 mothers not 59 mothers) Table 5 mentioned that 16 mothers started the first session of breast feeding &lt;1 hr with no prelacteal feeds and 0 mothers with prelacteal feeds.</li><li>2. Did 43 mothers start the first session of breast feeding &lt;1 hr or in the group &gt;1hr to 24 hr with prelacteal feeds or no prelacteal feeds?</li><li>3. How many babies in this study having colostrum only ?</li><li>4. How many babies in this study having colostrum with additional prelacteal feeds?</li></ol> <p>There are a lot of confusion of the figures in between table 4 and 5 (last category), When 59 (23.7%) mothers practised early initiation of breast feeding is real, the missing figure 43 mothers who could started the first session of breast feeding &lt;1 hr but they might give prelacteal feeds. This point is important as these figure could change the comment of that prelacteal feeding was significantly associated with early initiation of breast feeding.(p=0.022; instead of p=0.055; as mentioned in abstract.) In addition the prevalence of prelacteal feeding in this study would be changed if 16 mothers started the first session of breast feeding &lt;1 hr.</p> <p>The others conclusions i.e the practice of prelacteal feedings was significantly associates with mode of delivery, baby's birth weight iare acceptable.</p>	<p>Thank you for your review. The reviewer's comments have been accepted and manuscript has been corrected.</p> <p>Key points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.) The missing 43 respondents gave both breast milk and prelacteal feed within one hour of birth.</li><li>2.) Only 16 (6.4%) gave only breast milk within one hour of birth.</li><li>3.) Other errors have also been corrected in tables 4 and five.</li><li>4.) All corrections are highlighted in the manuscript.</li></ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	There are many typing errors in this manuscript. For example, in the abstract last sentence ( should focus on early initiation ?and ?of breast feeding )	Corrections have been made.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The aims of the this study is meaningful all 3 points ( knowledge of breast feedin ,the practice of early initiation pof breast feedingand the practice of prelacteal feedinga	Thank you

### 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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	There were no ethical issues.