

Author's Feedback Against Editorial Comment :

I perused the article and the revisions and here are my comments:

1. the typographical errors have been dealt with appropriately

1.Thanks so much for the commendation

2. There is still usage of acronyms without expansion (LUT, MNE, PNE) given at the point of their first occurrence.

2. The usage of acronyms without expansion (LUT, MNE, PNE) given at the point of their first occurrence has been amended.

3. The article lacks serious statistical analyses despite the authors' claim to the use of a professional statistician. They have presented only one chi-square test result which just satisfies one research there is no other analyses reported. The prevalence values are reported without any confidence intervals which is a serious lapse for any quality publication. Since the estimates are based on a sample and not the entire population, the percentage of children in the survey with a certain health occurrence may differ from the "true" prevalence of that characteristic in the Nigerian children population (for example) simply by chance. **Confidence intervals** take this error into account and present a range in which the "true value" is likely to fall. My advice for the authors is to work on their raw data with the statistician and present their results appropriately with full scientific rigor to be considered for publication.

3. Unfortunately all the works of the statistician were not presented. We hereby represent all the detail work of the statistician. At this point we have done our best possible, and we would be glad if this paper be accepted because we cannot go further than this we cannot falsify figures.