## **Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Gynaecology
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 <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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)

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

# **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	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 >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.  Questions  1. How many mothers starting the first session of breast feeding <1 hr? (reviewer think only 16 mothers not 59 mothers)  Table 5 mentioned that 16 mothers started the first session of breast feeding <1 hr with no prelacteal feeds and 0 mothers with prelacteal feeds.  2. Did 43 mothers start the first session of breast feeding <1 hr or in the group >1hr to 24 hr with prelacteal feeds or no prelacteal feeds?  3. How many babies in this study having colostrum only?  4. How many babies in this study having colostrum with additional prelacteal feeds?  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 <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 <1 hr.  The others conclusions i.e the practice of prelacteal feedings was significantly associates with mode of delivery, baby's birth weight iare acceptable.	
Minor 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 )	
Optional/General 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	

## 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)	

# Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aye Aye Myint
Department, University & Country	University of Medicine Mandalay, Myanmar

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)