



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_48805
Title of the Manuscript:	ANAEMIA IN PREGNANCY AT BOOKING: PREVALENCE AND RISK FACTORS AMONG ANTENATAL ATTENDEES IN A SOUTHERN NIGERIA GENERAL HOSPITAL
Type of the Article	ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPERS

**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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Review</p> <p><b>ANAEMIA IN PREGNANCY AT BOOKING: PREVALENCE AND RISK FACTORS AMONG ANTENATAL ATTENDEES IN A SOUTHERN NIGERIA GENERAL HOSPITAL</b></p> <p><b>Methodology</b></p> <p>Pregnant women with no formal education were assisted with local dialect by the research assistants.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statement could be made more clear as follows</li> </ol> <p>Pregnant women with no formal education were assisted by research assistants in the use of local dialect.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At what time was the blood collected?</li> <li>Were the blood samples collected fasting or random?</li> </ol> <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Out of 265 anaemic respondents, greater percentage 205 (77.36%) had moderate anaemia (Hb:7-9.9g/dl) while least percentage 11(4.15%) had severe anaemia (Hb &lt;7.0g/dl).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The foregoing could be re-cast as follows</li> </ol> <p>Out of 265 anaemic respondents, the majority, 205 (representing 77.36%) had moderate anaemia (Hb:7-9.9g/dl), while least, 11(representing 4.15%) had severe anaemia (Hb &lt;7.0g/dl).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More than two thirds of the respondents (61.51%) were married.</li> </ol> <p>Two thirds of the 265 is about 177. Thus, 163 or 61.5% cannot be two thirds</p> <p><b>6. Table 2: Family and nutrition characteristics of the respondent</b></p> <p>This title does not adequately capture all the information in the table, so it could be modified as follows;</p> <p><b>Table 2: Some practices and nutritional characteristics of the respondents</b></p> <p>Footnote under Table 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>***228 of the respondents were para <math>\geq 1</math></li> </ol> <p>Modify to</p> <p>***228 of the respondents had parity <math>\geq 1</math></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.1% prevalence of HIV is frightening, so it should not be trivialized as 'only.'</li> </ol> <p><b>References</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check the following references; there are some errors</li> </ol> <p>24,25, 26, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 44.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some errors have been corrected using track changes.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pregnant women with no formal education were assisted by research assistant in the use of local dialect- Agreed and correction effected</li> <li>The blood samples were collected after the administration of the questionnaire. As the pregnant women came in , their biodata were collected, health talk done, vital signs and anthropometry measured,; they were then approached and informed about the study-the study was explained to them, consent obtained , questionnaire administered and the blood sample obtained.</li> <li>The blood samples for the determination of the pregnant women's haemoglobin were random as they had eaten at home before coming to the clinic.s.</li> <li>Out of 265 anaemic respondents, the majority, 205 (representing 77.36%) had moderate anaemia (Hb:7-9.9g/dl), while least, 11 (representing 4.15%) had severe anaemia (Hb&lt;7.0g/dl).- agreed and corrected</li> <li>Agreed and corrected. Two thirds of 265 is 177 which is 66.79%.</li> <li>Some practices and nutritional characteristics of the respondents- agreed and corrected</li> <li>***228 of the respondents had parity <math>\geq 1</math>-agreed and corrected.</li> <li>7.1% prevalence of HIV . 'only' is removed. Agreed and corrected.</li> </ol>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

		<p>9. Errors in references 24, 25, 26, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 44 corrected as highlighted.</p> <p>10. Thank you for correcting some errors using tract changes.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Overall recommendation</p> <p>Subject to the correction of the minor errors pointed out, the paper can be accepted.</p>	<p>Thank you.</p>

**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>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Apart from the ethical clearance obtained from the health research and ethical committee of the state ministry of health, the written permission obtained from the administrative head of the hospital and the consent obtained from the respondents, the research has no other ethical issues associated with it.</p>	<p>I agree with the reviewer's comments and the minor errors highlighted have been corrected appropriately. Thank you.</p>