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PART 1: Comments

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment****Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | *The manuscript addresses a highly relevant public health issue: infant and young child feeding (IYCF) practices in humanitarian settings. It offers a comprehensive dataset and valuable insights into the cultural and operational challenges of improving nutrition among Rohingya refugees. Given the scale of the Rohingya crisis and the vulnerability of children under two years, the findings are timely and of high importance.****Suggestions:**** *Clearly relate the findings to potential policy shifts or global nutrition benchmarks (e.g., SDG 2: Zero Hunger).*
 |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | *The current title is factual but lacks specificity about the methodology and key contribution.****Suggestion:****A more informative title could be:** ***"Determinants of Infant and Young Child Feeding Practices among Rohingya Refugees: A Mixed-Methods Survey in Cox’s Bazar Camps, Bangladesh"***
 |  |
| **Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.** | *The abstract provides a fair summary but lacks clarity and precision in parts. Some methods and results are mentioned in detail while others (e.g., qualitative results, implications) are overlooked.****Suggestions:**** *Add after "Methods": "We used a mixed-methods design combining quantitative household surveys (N=...) and qualitative focus group discussions (N=...)."*
* *Quantitative results: e.g. exclusive breastfeeding rate, minimum diet diversity.*
* *Qualitative results: perceptions of cultural or operational barriers.*
* *End: Add a sentence along the lines of "Findings highlight critical areas for targeted nutrition programming in refugee settings."*
 |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | *The study uses a sound cross-sectional, mixed-methods design. The use of WHO indicators and Raosoft-based sample size calculation is appropriate. Ethical considerations are well discussed.**However, there are a few limitations:**The generalizability is limited since SMART survey methodology is not optimized for all IYCF indicators.**Some numerical data (e.g., exclusive breastfeeding rates) vary slightly between the abstract, results, and figures - this needs consistency.****Suggestions:**** *Recheck coherence of statistics across all sections.*
* *Include confidence intervals in key result tables in the abstract or discussion.*
* *Clarify how* qualitative data were thematically analyzed (coding method? software used?).
 |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | *The references are mostly relevant and include recent works (e.g., up to 2024). However, there is* ***over-reliance****on articles by the same authors (Arzu, Sujan et al.), many published in lower-tier journals.****Suggestions:**** *Add more internationally peer-reviewed sources (e.g., Maternal & Child Nutrition, The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health).*
* *Include at least one systematic review/meta-analysis on IYCF practices in emergency settings (e.g., Black et al., 2021; UNICEF IYCF-E guidelines).*
* *Consider including regional comparisons (e.g., IYCF data from Rohingya in Myanmar or other refugee camps in South Asia).*
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| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | The English is generally understandable, but the manuscript needs **extensive language editing** for:*Review grammar, verb tense and sentence structure. Rewrite clumsy wording.**Employing a more sustained academic register****Suggestions:**** *“This mainly focuses on respondents’ knowledge...” → “this assesses respondents’ knowledge...”*
* *“Children were asked personal or upsetting questions...” →probably“Children were not asked...”*
* *“Each focus group will comprise…” → correct en “comprised” (past).*
* *Review all long or repetitive sentences for brevity.*
 |  |
| **Optional/General** comments | *The manuscript titled "Infant and Young Child Feeding (IYCF) Survey in the Rohingya Camps, Cox’s Bazar, Bangladesh" presents original and valuable data on IYCF practices in a vulnerable refugee population. The study is timely and relevant, especially in the context of nutrition programming in humanitarian settings.**However, several aspects need clarification and improvement before the manuscript can be considered for publication:*1. ***Ethical Approval****: While ethical considerations are well described, the authors must provide the name of the ethics committee that approved the study and the approval/reference number.*
2. ***Conflict of Interest Statement****: A formal declaration regarding competing interests is missing and should be added.*
3. ***Language Quality****: The manuscript would benefit from professional English editing to improve grammar, structure, and overall clarity.*
4. ***Abstract and Title****: The abstract should be more comprehensive, including more specific methods and key findings. The title could be revised to better reflect the scope and methodology.*
5. ***Reference Diversity****: The references should be expanded to include more peer-reviewed, high-impact, and internationally recognized literature, particularly beyond works from a single author group.*
6. ***Scientific Rigor****: While the methodology is generally sound, clearer justification of sampling and description of qualitative data analysis procedures is needed.*
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