Paper: "**Prevalence and Determinants of Delayed Newborn Bathing among Postnatal Mothers in a Rural Community of Northern Ghana**"

Corresponding Author: John Alem

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Tolouian, Audrey C", University of Texas at El Paso, USA

# ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
*ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

| | |
|---|---|
| Reviewer Name: Audrey Tolouian | Email: |
| University/Country: University of Texas at El Paso USA | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 3/30/2020 | Date Review Report Submitted: 3/31/2020 |
| Manuscript Title: Prevalence and Determinants of Delayed Newborn Bathing among Postnatal Mothers in Bawku Municipality. | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    Yes/No | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:Yes/No<br><br>You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:Yes/No | |

## Evaluation Criteria:

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

| *Questions* | *Rating Result*<br>[Poor] **1-5**<br>[Excellent] |
|---|---|
| **1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.** | **5** |
| *(Please insert your comments)* | |
| **2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.** | **5** |
| *(Please insert your comments)* | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.** | 3 |
| *(Please insert your comments)* | |
| **4. The study methods are explained clearly.** | 5 |
| *(Please insert your comments)* | |
| **5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.** | 3 |
| *(Please insert your comments)*<br>**There are a fair number of grammatical errors throughout the paper- a once over would be good** | |
| **6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.** | 4 |
| *(Please insert your comments)* | |
| **7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.** | 2 |
| *(Please insert your comments)*<br>*The references, though pertinent, are dated- with more than 10% being past the five year mark.* | |

## Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|---|---|
| Accepted, no revision needed | |
| Accepted, minor revision needed | **x** |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | |
| Reject | |

## Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It would be helpful to explain early on what the MDG 4 is.
Pg 5- The first SBA should be spelled out
In Measurements- pg 8_ please explain: some questions that were not applicable to this study were excluded and some responses changed as well._ What is meant by changed responses? Spell out ANC
Results: Sub header- capital letters
Discussion Header pg 18 misspelled

## Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: