

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Effective breastfeeding technique and associated factors among lactating mothers at Gidan District, Northeast, Ethiopia: A community-based cross-sectional study
AUTHORS	Asmamaw, Desale; Habitu, Yohannes; Negash, Wubshet Debebe; Desta, Dawit Zenamarkos; Mekonnen, Eskedar

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Tiruye, Getahun Haramaya University
REVIEW RETURNED	12-Jan-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Title</p> <p>1. According to the BMJ manuscript submission guideline, the title should include the study design in line with the research question. Please refer and adhere to submission guidelines.</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>2. Although writing an English scientific manuscript is a challenge for many scholars, especially for non-native speakers, I appreciate the authors' efforts. However, there are many grammatical errors and language across the document. As a result in the scholarly community, it is important to maintain the message being conveyed in the manuscript is unambiguous as possible. Hence, your manuscript must be reviewed by a person proficient in written English.</p> <p>Methods</p> <p>3. "Binary logistic regression was used to model the odds of having a positive association with effective breastfeeding technique and to investigate factors associated with the behavior Adjusted Odds Ratio with its corresponding confidence interval (95%) was used as a measure of association and in the multivariable logistic regression model p-value of < 0.05 as an indicator of statistical significance." These are long sentences and the message conveyed is not understandable. Please rewrite this idea in a correct grammatical form and rewrite the method section again. Also, consider putting an explanation for the outcome variable.</p> <p>Result</p> <p>1. You mentioned in the method section that you have used a community-based cross-sectional study. But in the result section, you are interested to explain the primary outcome in terms of proportion. Please refer and come up with appropriate epidemiological terms, when someone employed a community-based study. Further, the authors did not describe the sample size in the method section and similarly, the total participants were not considered in the result section. Hence, this would be difficult to have an insight after reading the abstract despite it being the</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>summary of the main document. Also, consider rewriting the result section attractively after using appropriate obstetrical terms.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The odds of adopting effective breastfeeding technique was higher among mothers who had ANC follow-up, institutional delivery, and received a postpartum home visit by the health extension workers. Please try to avoid redundancy as this idea is the repetition of the result section and does not go in line with the conclusion. I recommend taking these issues to describe the result after putting their respective statistical figure. Also, replace the word adopting with “practicing”. <p>Strength and limitation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This study was conducted in a community including both rural and urban areas that address mothers who did not have a history of visiting health facilities. Does being from urban resident is a guarantee for visiting health facilities? 2. The study might not be free from bias due to introducing inter-observer variability and the Hawthorne effect. This is a very critical problem in measuring the outcome variable which significantly compromises your work and it is not simply that you bypass through acknowledging it as a limitation of the study. how do you handle it? Needs a convincing explanation in the methods sections. <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. While writing an introduction, it is better to start from the definition of your primary outcome variable i.e. Effective breastfeeding technique. Then, you better to proceed in describing the burden of the problem from the global perspective and Ethiopia as well. 2. Paragraph 2 line 59 “Breastfeeding is a learned skill as it is not a single suckling action but a series of behaviors which depends on the integrated coordination between mothers and. ” does that mean breastfeeding practice or BFT? Is breastfeeding practice or technique merely a learned skill? infants that can be effective or ineffective Citation?? 3. Appropriate breastfeeding practice had numerous importance in preventing communicable and non-communicable diseases, including....please be coherent in using terms BFT and breastfeeding practice?? 4. From line 62 to line 67, the authors explained about breastfeeding practice but at the end authors compared the finding of descriptions resulting from BF practice with ineffective breastfeeding technique? Please rewrite these findings according to your research question. And also please briefly elaborate on the adverse outcomes both in the child and the mother’s life and others associated with Ineffective breastfeeding techniques (IBT) 5. “Globally, there are an estimated 20,000 maternal deaths from breast cancer that could be prevented through increasing breastfeeding practices” this is an additional benefit of EBF other than the infant side. Therefore, it is better to merge these sentences with paragraph 2 6. Line 69 More than half a million infants die each year due to nutritional deficiency ascribed by..... where? 7. Take the issues of paragraph 4 to paragraphs 3 and 2 then merge according to the content 8. The practice of effective breastfeeding techniques varies across different settings that range from.... Please specify the finding prevalence for each country 9. What measures/solutions were taken to enhance the practice of EBT in sub-Saharan African in general if any or Ethiopia in
--	---

	<p>particular. Please explain this concept in one paragraph and describe the undressed issues in the next para.</p> <p>10. stabilized and gets comfortable, which could ultimately affect the breastfeeding techniques citation ?whose limitation of this study is. majority of the prior studies were based at institutions involving mothers who come. Citation?. whose limitation of this study is</p> <p>After considering all the aforementioned comments, please rewrite a convincing introduction by maintaining the flow of ideas across each paragraph??</p> <p>Methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All lactating mothers (mother-child pairs) having child less than six months of age at Gidan. replace child with infant 2. Please explain the data quality control measures before the onset of actual data collection. 3. Which comes first? Is it observation or the interview? Explain in the method section 4. The study employed a community-based cross-sectional design?? If so who is responsible to diagnose the Breast problem?? Did the data collectors have taken some training in sensitization. Please explain <p>Result</p> <p>OK. except for language and grammatical problem</p> <p>The odds of effective breastfeeding techniques among mothers who had at least one ANC.....but in the table section you didn't have a questionnaire which asks frequency of ANC except yes/no response</p> <p>Discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Paragraph 1 long sentence without using punctuation. Please rephrase 2. Moreover, this study was conducted in a large community including both mothers who had a history of visiting health institutions and those who had not, which helps.....how did you know whether mothers had a history of visiting health institutions or not ??? 3. Explain the implication of this study <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Please conclude what you find and suggest a strong recommendation based on your findings</p>
--	---

REVIEWER	Bante, Agegnehu Arba Minch University, School of Nursing
REVIEW RETURNED	19-Jan-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>First of all I would like to say thank you for considering me to review this paper. Though the manuscript is written well, it needs further revisions/clarifications.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) As the abstract is a stand alone summary of the whole work, it must answer the following questions: When the study was conducted? and How many participants were involved? Hence, incorporate these information to make the abstract complete. 2) The method section needs further modification; better to merge "the source and study population" and "inclusion and exclusion criteria subheadings" as "study participants" or other inclusive name just to avoid redundancy of statements. The other concern here is the sampling procedure, How multistage sampling was applied? As written in line 104, the district has 2 urban and 21 rural kebeles and as written in line 127, Seven kebeles were randomly selected. Unless first stratified as rural and urban kebeles, the chance of missing the urban kebeles is very high using simple
-------------------------	---

	<p>random sampling. So, how it was managed because 187 (24.6%) of your participants are urban dwellers. To make it clear, better to mention how many rural and urban kebeles included? Under the data collection tool section "the outcome variable measurement" (WHO breastfeeding observational checklist) needs further elaboration" about the number of items for each component, validity issue and so forth. Statements written from lines 192-198 are not operational definitions rather they are term definitions which are not as such important and better to remove it.</p> <p>3) Under the discussion section; the justifications given for the proportion discrepancies must be specific to the compared article. Eg. the justification written in lines 253-256 says“the former studies were conducted in 2013”... this statement is not appropriate for reference no. 15, which was conducted in 2019. Avoid such errors throughout the discussion. In addition, use all the available similar articles particularly from Ethiopia and other developing nations; for example why did not use this study? "Breastfeeding technique and associated factors among lactating mothers visiting Gondar town health facilities, Northwest Ethiopia: observational method" .</p>
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

S. no.	Comments	Response
1	According to the BMJ manuscript submission guideline, the title should include the study design according to the research question. Please refer and adhere to submission guidelines	Comment accepted, and the study design is included. Kindly see page 1, line number 2-3.
2	Although writing an English scientific manuscript is a challenge for many scholars, especially for non-native speakers, I appreciate the authors' efforts. However, there are many grammatical errors and language across the document. As a result in the scholarly community, it is important to maintain the message being conveyed in the manuscript is unambiguous as possible. Hence, your manuscript must be reviewed by a person proficient in written English.	The entire article has been reviewed by a person who is efficient in written English.

3	<p>“Binary logistic regression was used to model the odds of having a positive association with effective breastfeeding technique and to investigate factors associated with the behaviour. Adjusted Odds Ratio with its corresponding confidence interval (95%) was used as a measure of association and in the multivariable logistic regression model p-value of < 0.05 as an indicator of statistical significance.” These are long sentences and the message conveyed is not understandable. Please rewrite this idea in a correct grammatical form and rewrite the method section again. Also, consider putting an explanation for the outcome variable.</p>	<p>We agree with your concern. The sentence has been modified and become easy to understand. Kindly see page 2, line number 27-33.</p>
4	<p>You mentioned in the method section that you have used a community-based cross-sectional study. But in the result section, you are interested to explain the primary outcome in terms of proportion. Please refer and come up with appropriate epidemiological terms, when someone employed a community-based study. Further, the authors did not describe the sample size in the method section and similarly, the total participants were not considered in the result section. Hence, this would be difficult to have an insight after reading the abstract despite it being the summary of the main document. Also, consider rewriting the result section attractively after using appropriate obstetrical terms.</p>	<p>The comment is appreciated, as we don't know precisely the denominator 'Prevalence' is the appropriate epidemiological term to be used. Thus, revision has been made accordingly. Kindly see page 2, line number 34-39.</p> <p>The sample size and the response are clearly stated in the revised manuscript. Moreover, appropriate obstetric terms have been used.</p>

5	<p>The odds of adopting effective breastfeeding technique was higher among mothers who had ANC follow-up, institutional delivery, and received a postpartum home visit by the health extension workers. Please try to avoid redundancy as this idea is the repetition of the result section and does not go in line with the conclusion. I recommend taking these issues to describe the result after putting their respective statistical figure. Also, replace the word adopting with “practicing”</p>	<p>Comment accepted and corrected accordingly. Kindly see on pages 2 and 3, line number 40-46.</p>
6	<p>This study was conducted in a community including both rural and urban areas that address mothers who did not have a history of visiting health facilities. Does being from urban resident is a guarantee for visiting health facilities.</p>	<p>Dear, we appreciate your concern; the study was conducted at the community level that included both urban and rural mothers with or without a history of visiting health facilities. Being an urban resident, won't guarantee a mother to visit a health facility, although they might have better access and opportunity to do so.</p>
7	<p>The study might not be free from bias due to introducing inter-observer variability and the Hawthorne effect. This is a very critical problem in measuring the outcome variable which significantly compromises your work and it is not simply that you bypass through acknowledging it as a limitation of the study. How do you handle it? Needs a convincing explanation in the methods sections.</p>	<p>Thank you for the suggestion; this has been briefly explained in the method section of the revised manuscript. Kindly see page 7, line number 153-159.</p> <p>We have also described the issue in the limitation section as it is not possible to avoid that completely.</p>
	<p>Introduction</p>	

1	While writing an introduction, it is better to start from the definition of your primary outcome variable i.e. Effective breastfeeding technique. Then, you better proceed in describing the burden of the problem from the global perspective and Ethiopia as well.	Thank you for the comment. This has been addressed. Kindly see page 4, line number 57-64.
2	Paragraph 2 line 59 “Breastfeeding is a learned skill as it is not a single suckling action but a series of behaviours which depends on the integrated coordination between mothers and. ” does that mean breastfeeding practice or BFT? Is breastfeeding practice or technique merely a learned skill? Infants that can be effective or ineffective Citation??	Dear, we appreciate your concern. We acknowledged that the sentence was a bit confusing. Moreover, we have recognized the sentence has less relevance for our research question considering that we had removed it from the revised manuscript.
3	Appropriate breastfeeding practice had numerous importance in preventing communicable and non-communicable diseases, including....please be coherent in using terms BFT and breastfeeding practice??	Comment accepted, this has been corrected. Kindly see pages 4, line number 67-69.
4	From line 62 to line 67, the authors explained about breastfeeding practice, but at the end authors compared the finding of descriptions resulting from BF practice with ineffective breastfeeding technique? Please rewrite these findings according to your research question. And also please briefly elaborate on the adverse outcomes both in the child and the mother’s life and others associated with Ineffective breastfeeding techniques (IBT)	Comment accepted, and necessary modifications have been considered. Kindly see pages 4-5, line number 65-83.
5	“Globally, there are an estimated 20,000 maternal deaths from breast cancer that could be prevented through increasing breastfeeding practices” this is an additional	This has been addressed and revised in the new version. Kindly

	benefit of EBF other than the infant side. Therefore, it is better to merge these sentences with paragraph 2	see the updated version of the manuscript.
6	Line 69 More than half a million infants die each year due to nutritional deficiency ascribed by..... where?	Comment accepted, and it has been corrected. Kindly see page 4, line number 74-75
7	Take the issues of paragraph 4 to paragraphs 3 and 2, then merge according to the content.	We have revised the content to keep the coherence. Kindly see the updated version of the manuscript.
8	The practice of effective breastfeeding techniques varies across different settings that range from.... Please specify the finding prevalence for each country	We do agree with the concern raised; it has been modified accordingly. Kindly see page 4, line number 84-87.
9	What measures/solutions were taken to enhance the practice of EBT in sub-Saharan African in general if any or Ethiopia in particular? Please explain this concept in one paragraph and describe the undressed issues in the next para.	This has been addressed. Kindly See page 5, line number 91-97.
10 stabilized and gets comfortable, which could ultimately affect the breastfeeding techniques citation? whose limitation of this study is. majority of the prior studies were based at institutions involving mothers who come. Citation?. whose limitation of this study is	Comment accepted, and this has been addressed. Kindly see page 5-6, line number 102-111
	Methods	
1	All lactating mothers (mother-child pairs) having child less than six months of age at Gidan. Replace child with infant	This has been modified. Kindly see page 7, line number 122-125.

2	Please explain the data quality control measures before the onset of actual data collection.	Comment accepted, this has been addressed. Kindly see page 9, line number 171-180.
3	Which comes first? Is it observation or the interview? Explain in the method section	The observation has been one prior to the interview. This has been explained in the updated version of the manuscript. Kindly see page 10, line number 185-192.
4	The study employed a community-based cross-sectional design?? If so who is responsible to diagnose the Breast problem?? Did the data collectors have taken some training in sensitization? Please explain	Dear, we acknowledge your concern. The data collectors were health professionals (BSc midwife and nursing) and data collectors who had taken training supported with video aids, including how to diagnose breast problems. Kindly see page 9, line number 171-180.
	Result	
1	OK. except for language and grammatical problem	Thanks for the observation; the language and grammatical problems were corrected in the updated version of the manuscript.
2	The odds of effective breastfeeding technique among mothers who had at least one ANC.....but in the table sections, you didn't have a questionnaire which asks frequency of ANC except yes/no response	There was a question in the tool although we didn't list it in the table. Comment accepted, and the mistake has been corrected in the updated version of the

		manuscript. Kindly see page 12, line number 246-248.
	Discussion	
1	Paragraph 1 long sentence without using punctuation. Please rephrase	Thanks for your observation. We have revised the sentence. Kindly see page 14, line number 256-260.
2	Moreover, this study was conducted in a large community including both mothers who had a history of visiting health institutions and those who had not, which helps.... How did you know whether mothers had a history of visiting health institutions or not ???	Dear, we appreciate your concern. Although there is a permissible limitation that would introduce bias, We had just interviewed mothers whether they visit health institutions or not. Kindly see page 16, line number 323-326.
3	Explain the implication of this study	Comment accepted. This has been addressed in the updated version of the manuscript. Kindly see page 16, line number 319-322.
	Conclusion	
1	Please conclude what you find and suggest a strong recommendation based on your findings.	Comment accepted, and necessary modifications have been considered. Kindly see page 17, line number 334-340.
	Reviewer #2	

1	As the abstract is a standalone summary of the whole work, it must answer the following questions: When the study was conducted? How many participants were involved? Hence, incorporate this information to make the abstract complete.	Comment accepted. Kindly see page 2, line number 25-26.
2	The method section needs further modification; better to merge "the source and study population" and "inclusion and exclusion criteria subheadings" as "study participants" or other inclusive name just to avoid redundancy of statements	The comment has been accepted. Kindly see page 7, line number 121-125
3	The other concern here is the sampling procedure, How multistage sampling was applied? As written in line 104, the district has 2 urban and 21 rural kebeles and as written in line 127, Seven kebeles were randomly selected. Unless first stratified as rural and urban kebeles, the chance of missing the urban kebeles is very high using simple random sampling. So, how it was managed because 187 (24.6%) of your participants are urban dwellers. To make it clear, better to mention how many rural and urban kebeles included?	Thank you for the very important concern. Yes, you are right; the procedure we actually followed to gather the data was not well narrated. Now, we have clearly described the section. Kindly see page 7-8, line number 131-138.
4	Under the data collection tool section, "the outcome variable measurement "(WHO breastfeeding observational checklist) needs further elaboration" about the number of items for each component, validity issue and so forth.	The comment is well appreciated and accepted. We have stated the detail. Kindly see page 9, line number 165-170.
5	Statements written from lines 192-198 are not operational definitions rather, they are term definitions which are not as such important and better to remove it.	Yes, the written statements were an operational definition and a description of another term, which

		<p>is breast problems. The main reason for doing this is to clarify the term for readers who are not experts in the area. Considering the importance of mentioning this definition, we have modified the subheading as “operational and variable definition”. Kindly see the updated version of the manuscript.</p>
6	<p>Under the discussion section, the justifications given for the proportion discrepancies must be specific to the compared article. Eg. the justification written in lines 253-256 says“the former studies were conducted in 2013”... this statement is not appropriate for reference no. 15, which was conducted in 2019. Avoid such errors throughout the discussion</p>	<p>Thank you for your observations. We have corrected the mistake. Kindly see page 14, line number 265-269.</p>
7	<p>use all the available similar articles, particularly from Ethiopia and other developing nations; for example why did not use this study? "Breastfeeding technique and associated factors among lactating mothers visiting Gondar town health facilities, Northwest Ethiopia: observational method".</p>	<p>Thank you for your suggestion. We could not discuss our result with the article conducted in Gondar, Ethiopia, published after submitting our manuscript. We have discussed their result in this revised version of our manuscript. Kindly see page 14, line number 277-279.</p>

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Tiruye, Getahun Haramaya University
REVIEW RETURNED	05-Apr-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Abstract</p> <p>Method: 1. the total sample size in the method section or the result were not mentioned? It would be difficult for someone to understand what 42% EBT means without reporting the enrolled study participants</p> <p>Conclusion: 1. The practice of effective breastfeeding technique practice was significantly associated among mothers who have ANC follow-up, deliver at health institutions, and receive postnatal home visits by the health extension workers.... This is the repetition of the result section, 2. I would recommend omitting these statements and proceeding to the appropriate recommendation.</p> <p>3. Do health extension workers are not maternal, neonatal, and child health care providers? Please take look at the recommendation section</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>1. paragraph 3: please report the collective findings from the/ average from India than repeating India.</p> <p>Methods</p> <p>1. How did data collectors handle the participants if they found participants with cracked nipples, engorgement...and others. Needs an explanation in the method section</p> <p>The whole parts of the narration in the document need language edition by a person proficient in the English Language</p>
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Bante, Agegnehu Arba Minch University, School of Nursing
REVIEW RETURNED	30-Mar-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	All of my concerns raised in the first round review were well addressed. I do not have any additional comments.
-------------------------	---

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

S. no.	Reviewer 2 comments	Authors' response
1	The total sample size in the method section or the result were not mentioned? It would be difficult for someone to understand what 42% EBT means without reporting the enrolled study participants	Comment accepted. This has been addressed. Kindly see page 2, line number 33-34.

2	<p>The practice of effective breastfeeding technique practice was significantly associated among mothers who have ANC follow-up, deliver at health institutions, and receive postnatal home visits by the health extension workers....</p> <p>This is the repetition of the result section, 2. I would recommend omitting these statements and proceeding to the appropriate recommendation.</p>	<p>Comment accepted and this has been modified and corrected accordingly. Kindly see on pages 2, line number 39-42.</p>
3	<p>Do health extension workers are not maternal, neonatal, and child health care providers? Please take look at the recommendation section</p>	<p>Thank you for your observation and comments. The error has been corrected in the updated version of the manuscript.</p>
4	<p>Please report the collective findings from the/ average from India than repeating India.</p>	<p>Thank you for your suggestion. This ha has been corrected. Kindly see page 5, line number 83-84.</p>
5	<p>How did data collectors handle the participants if they found participants with cracked nipples, engorgement...and others</p>	<p>Dear, thank you for your comment. The data collectors were health professionals (BSc midwife and nursing). The data collectors linked the mothers to the nearest health facilities who had breast problems such as mastitis, engorgement, and crackle nipple. Kindly see page 10, line number 189-190.</p>
6	<p>Needs an explanation in the method section</p> <p>The whole parts of the narration in the document need</p>	<p>The entire article has been reviewed by a person who is efficient in written English.</p>

	language edition by a person proficient in the English Language	
--	--	--