

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Early postnatal home visit coverage by health extension workers and associated factors among postpartum women in Gidan district, Northeast Ethiopia

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: John Bua

Submitted on: 15 Aug 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605203

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The study revealed that postnatal care home visit coverage by health extension workers was low at 15%. The coverage was mainly affected by factors that included women's education, health facility delivery, distance or time to the health facility and a woman being a member of the pregnant women forum.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Its strength was that it was a community based survey.

Its limitations was cant establish cause and effect due to being cross-sectional in nature. It also had a potential for recall bias which could have affected the outcome.

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

Major comments

Introduction

line: 31–32; Prenatal care is care before birth or delivery. Your statement refers to postnatal care and not prenatal care.

line 46; Revise grammar. The government of Ethiopia has provided basic health services.

Methods

line 85; Why did you select 30% of the Kebeles? Didn't that affect the external validity of your study? Please mention the justification.

line 133; P-value of 0.25 for binary analysis seems to big. What was the justification to use that value for analysis.

To control for effects of cofounders or effect modifiers, why did you not use back and forth method to identify cofounders and adjust for them in your logistical regression model. Which cofounders were identified in the analysis?

You should have a table showing results from the bivariate analysis.

Limitations

How did you minimise the recall bias during the data collection? Not mentioned.

You did not mention limitation of the study not covering mothers who delivered from home or in areas not covered by health extension workers. This could affect the external validity of the study.

Minor changes;
Need to revise grammar and proof reading.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

The title is appropriate.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

The keywords are appropriate.

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes but there is need to revise the grammar and proof reading the article.

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

The reference list is adequate.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality



Q 10 Rigor



Q 11 Significance to the field



Q 12 Interest to a general audience



Q 13 Quality of the writing



Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study



REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Minor revisions.