

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Mapping concurrent wasting and stunting among under-five children in India: A Multi-level analysis

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Mogan KA

Submitted on: 03 Apr 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605654

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

No answer given.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

No answer given.

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.

General Comment:

The present paper explores the burden and determinants of concurrent stunting and wasting among the under-five children of India. I have the following comments, which may assist in improving the manuscript:

1. Abstract

The language of the abstract section needs to be improved. For eg. The term co-existing the repeated multiple times in introduction. Many statements require rephrasing for better comprehension.

2. Ethics statement can be included as a line in the methodology section of the manuscript

3. Introduction

a. Correct background for the research has been described by the authors.

b. Lines 58,59- The authors have mentioned "Among them, India, the second most populous country, accounts for 40% of stunted children, translating to 62 million and 60 million under-weight children". Although the proportion mentioned (40%) is only for stunting, the authors have mentioned 60 million under-weight children at the end of the line. This is ambiguous and clarity is required on this.

c. Lines 68-69- Needs to be rephrased as the term negatively is repeating.

d. Line 84-85- Needs to be rephrased as the term India is repeating

4. Methods

The source of the data, variable studies and methods applied for the analysis are described by the authors.

a. Lines 148-149- "After examining all the 149 factors, we used the method suggested by Lawless and Singhal [reference]" Citation is missing.

b. Lines 154-155: What is a Primary sampling unit in this survey/analysis?

c. Line 159- Can AIC be expanded?

5. Results:

The authors have presented the results sequentially.

- a. Line 199–200: “Under 30 months of age, but not beyond, the pattern of sex 200 disparities was proportional to the severity of concurrent WaSt (Figure 4).” This statement needs to be clarified further.
- b. Line 208– “Table 1 shows the bivariate analysis of WaSt among children under five years of age in India” This line can be removed, and the Table 1 can be mentioned in brackets at the end of the paragraph
- c. Title of Table 2 needs clarity. It must be reframed.
- d. Table 2: Symbols used in the table *, **, *** have not been explained in the table. Authors should explain these in the footnote.

6. Discussion

Line: 263 “Female children were found to have a 29% lower prevalence” Is it lower prevalence or lower odds of prevalence?

Line 285: The concept of intersectional analysis has been mentioned by the authors. The authors can elaborate a little on this emerging social science aspect in the health sector.

7. Conclusion: Appropriate and no specific comments.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

The title is appropriate for the manuscript. However, the word ‘of’ can be added between the mapping and concurrent, and the title can be modified as follows: “Mapping of concurrent wasting and stunting among under-five children in India: A multilevel analysis”

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Overall, there is need to improve the language of the manuscript and minor grammatical errors. Abbreviations must be expanded when the author is mentioning it first time in the paper.

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?)

Yes

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.