



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_49177
Title of the Manuscript:	MATERNAL KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES TOWARDS PREVENTION AND MANAGEMENT OF CHILD DIARRHOEA IN URBAN AND RURAL MASERU, LESOTHO
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Author should check the disparity in the sample size i.e. sample size of 292 and 152 to the total number of répondent of 299 and 159 respectively. Why the variation ? 2. Author indicated a standardised research instrument was used for the data collection (was it up to date and does that address the objective for this study? 3. Reference should be provided in the right format as indicated in the authors guide. Should not be out of date/ too old. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The variation in sample size was secondary to the catchment population in the two centres in ratio 2:1 in the urban and rural settings respectively. This result, approximate to half of the sample size in the rural when compared to the urban. This variation ultimately canceled out for the result was analyzed in proportion. 2. The standardized tool for data collection was up to date and this was in form of the "Questionnaire "attached to the appendix (submitted with the manuscript). Adapted from reference 10, as stated in the manuscript and highlighted in yellow on # 115. This was precise, up to date and did address the objectives, for the analysis was based on the stated objectives of the study. 3. All references provided were in the right format as indicated in the authors guide and up to date. All were below 10 years.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See author's guide for formatting tables and figures and adequate discussions should be done. 2. Abstract should contain 100-300 words not in the case of this? 3. Author should affect corrections to grammatical errors as in the case "chid" in the introduction etc. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Author's guide for formatting tables and figures was adhered to in the correction and adequate discussions carried out. 2) Abstract was reduced from 317 to 271. 3) Corrections of grammatical errors effected as revealed, typographical error for child was corrected, on line 71 and 72. Note that the manuscript was initially proof-read.
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript looks good but it's more a theses than an article. 2. The entire manuscript should be between 3000-6000 words not in your case (including everything). 	The entire manuscript was reduced to less than 6000 words as recommended (excluding the references and appendices attached).



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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>No ethical issue was encountered during data collection.</p>	<p>The ethical recommendation was strictly adhered to as stipulated by BREC and consent forms signed by participants before completing the questionnaire (letter of ethical approval attached in the appendix).</p>