

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_76515
Title of the Manuscript:	"A STUDY ON PREVALENCE OF ANEMIA AMONG PREGNANT WOMEN ATTENDING ANTENATAL CLINIC AT RURAL HEALTH CENTRE (RHC) AND HOSPITAL, JABALPUR CITY, M.P."
Type of the Article	Original article

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>The article needs to go through English language proofreading.</p> <p>When presenting the data collection instrument, it is presented as "29 Pre designed and pre tested questionnaire". It is not clear whether 29 is the number of questions, nor whether it is a questionnaire that has already been used in other studies (a validated questionnaire). This information is important and should be further detailed in the methodology.</p> <p>The authors present as "Inclusion criteria" "study subjects age from less than 20 years to 30 and &gt; 30 years". Does this mean that pregnant women of all ages were included and that they were later divided into these three groups? This information must be presented more clearly in the methodology.</p> <p>The authors present in the Abstract and in the MATERIAL AND METHODS that the data collection took place in "1 year i.e.: from 1st September 2021 to 7th September 2021". If the collection was made between September 1 and 7, 2021, it seems confusing to state that it was within a year. Perhaps the text was a little confused in the English version.</p> <p>In an excerpt from the DISCUSSION, the authors state that "This association between socioeconomic status of the family and anemia in pregnancy was found to be statistically significant (P&lt; 0.05) [21]." If the result was found by the search, the citation of another work should not be presented. If the result found is similar to that of the cited work, the information must be presented with greater clarity.</p>	
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>It is agreed that whenever an abbreviation is used in the text; the first time it is used, it is preceded by use the long version. Check the "RHTC" abbreviation given in the objectives.</p>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>It is not necessary to present "aims and objectives" in outline. The general objective of the study could be presented in the last paragraph of the Introduction, without the outline formatting.</p> <p>In most of DISCUSSION the authors present the result of the study and compare it with that of previous studies. That's fine. However, it would be interesting if the authors were not limited to comparing the results, but also trying to explain them.</p> <p>For example, at the end of the Discussion, when it is discussed that pregnant vegetarians suffer more from anemia, the authors explain the role of meat in nutrition.</p> <p>However, when comparing the results of anemia between pregnant women in urban x rural areas; in different age groups; in the different ex-school conditions; occupation and gestational period, the authors limited themselves to comparing the results found with the results of previous studies, but did not explain or present hypotheses that explain the difference found.</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Luiz Evaristo Ricci Volpato</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidade de Cuiabá, Brazil</b>