

Review of: "Spatially Weighted Multinomial Modelling of Comorbidity of Anaemia and Malaria among Under Five Children in Nigeria"

Denis Okova

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Well done on this policy-relevant piece of work.

The paper is methodologically sound. The methods were well applied.

Comments

Abstract: Yes, I agree that your findings have value to policymakers and health authorities. But the HOW of this is missing. Remember, there are readers who only read the abstract.

Introduction: Please add a few sentences to contextualize malaria prevention efforts in Nigeria. Progress over time? Are they winning? Mention key malaria policies/programs in the country. Also, do not be shy to link this to global malaria prevention efforts. Where does UHC fall into all this? This would help link your study to policy.

Source of data: I see this is a section on its own. In a standard journal, this section should fall under the methods section. Please have a look at a standard journal.

Discussions and conclusions: This section needs to be reworked. I would recommend synthesizing the first 3 sentences of this section into one sentence. This should be easy because that info is presented earlier in the article. This would allow you to quickly jump into a discussion of your key results without losing the reader.

While you have done well to make sense of the results, you did not contextualise your findings in comparison to similar settings. Essentially, "This study found that ..., these results are different/similar to results found in an earlier study in Country X by.... These differences could be due to..." I would suggest you have a look at other discussion sections of published articles to improve your approach.

How about you just call this section "Discussion" and not "Discussion and Conclusion"?

Please be explicit with the strengths and limitations of the study.

Also, be explicit with the policy implications of your study. You've just done this in one sentence (the last sentence). Please make it more robust. While a reader might not have time to read through the entire article, they surely will be



interested to read its potential policy implications.

References: Please drop the bullet points. Use numbering.

I hope this was helpful.

Please do not hesitate to reach out should you need further assistance.