

Review of: "Risk Factors and Predictors of Severe Acute Malnutrition Among 6-59 Months Children in Lumbini Province, Nepal: A Facility-Based Cross-Sectional Study"

Man Kumar Tamang¹

¹ The University of Queensland

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper presents an important and generally neglected sectors of health in Nepal. I would like to thank the authors for conducting such a study to reveal scenario of one of the pressing health issues of Nepal and congratulate them for presenting the data in the current paper. In general, the manuscript is well written, structures are good and references are well arranged within the text. Some references need to be formatted in consistent format in the "reference section". Based on the review, I would recommend accepting it after the correction as mentioned in the following comments.

Introduction:

1. Paragraph 3, last sentence. The sentence has the text "...at a different setting...", however, I would suggest to mention the site of the study rather than just mentioning "different setting" to be clear.
2. Paragraph 4, line 5, the term "questionable". The determinants or risk factors can not be "questionable", they could be "further explored" or "remain to be examined" or maybe other use other suitable terms.
3. Paragraph 4, line 7, please use a single word for the phrase "factors and predictors".

Methodology:

1. Data collection: Please elaborate how the OTCs and NRHs were randomly selected and how the sampling sites were geographically located? Also, please include the list of OTCs and NRHs included in the study. You could present this information in a table.
2. Information on child and maternal level: I think the term "level" here seems to be odd. Please correct or edit this and use suitable word here.
3. Data analysis and management: Did you perform step-wise regression?

Results:

1. Socio-demographic characteristics of the participants: paragraph 2, line 1, the words "risk factor" is not suitable here. The place of residence IS NOT a risk factor, please use more suitable wordings here.
2. Please explain the findings of the logistic regression clearly.

Discussion:

1. Paragraph 3: Maternal age at childbirth (OR= 2.77) seems to be the most significant predictor or factor of childhood malnutrition, as evidenced by other studies also. The other factor, although statistically significant, has quite a low effect size. So, generally, the study raised the fact that low maternal age at childbirth has more likelihood of child being suffered from SAM. Please explain in detail how maternal age and nutrition in child are related.

Strengths and limitations:

1. If the OTCs and NRHs are randomly selected, then it would give representative data for the Lumbini province, not for the whole country. But yes generalization is not possible from this study.
2. Please remove the last two sentences and add relevant limitations. The sentence "The cross-sectional design of this study limited the authors' ability to assess the actual prevalence of acute malnutrition among children" has not been correctly written. The current study being targeted to SAM children, can not determine the prevalence of SAM.

Conclusion:

1. The prevalence data presented is misleading, please remove this. Given this study only recruited SAM children, the prevalence can not be calculated using only the data collected. The whole population data needs to be available to calculate the prevalence. So, please correct the sentences accordingly.
2. Only include most significant findings in conclusion and how the findings can be used to inform policies in the province.

References:

1. "Other references"??
2. Some references are not consistent. Please use consistent format.