



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_19826
Title of the Manuscript:	The Practice of Forced Feeding: Perception among Parents and Caregivers in Enugu, South East Nigeria
Type of the 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	*Confusing title. A more appropriate title is: Parents perception and practice of child forced feeding *Objectives: needs to be more specific & operational *Methods: the most defective part of the study -Study design is not clear. Is it descriptive or analytic? In current it is a nested case-control study -Nothing was mentioned about the validity (especially content validity) of the study tool. What is the operational definition of adequate/inadequate knowledge? -Less elaboration in study variables (just enumerate them) -Nothing was mentioned about sample size calculation, sampling methods & response rate -No ethical consideration was mentioned -This is a hospital-based study that lacks external validity *Results: delete table 1 *Discussion: add the practical implication of the results & study limitations *References: -Some out-dated references (2,5,7) -Reference 8: year of publication is missing	• Title recasted • Objectives modified as suggested (line 51-53) • Methods • Validity and reliability of study tool not assessed • Terms were used subjectively in this content - Observation on variables corrected (line 78-90) - Sampling method stated (line 71) - Ethical consideration added (line 74-76) • Table 1 deleted • Practical implication reflected in discussion and conclusion section (line 205-211) • Limitation of the study added (line 212-214) • "Out-dated references"- agreed but to the author's knowledge, there are no suitable recent substitute for these publications.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		Reference '8' year of publication added (line 232).
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Needs language & grammatical revision	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		