



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_48805
Title of the Manuscript:	AMAEMIA IN PREGNANCY AT BOOKING: PREVALENCE AND RISK FACTORS AMONG ANTENATAL ATTENDEES IN A SOUTHERN NIGERIA GENERAL HOSPITAL
Type of the 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://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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Review</p> <p>AMAEMIA IN PREGNANCY AT BOOKING: PREVALENCE AND RISK FACTORS AMONG ANTENATAL ATTENDEES IN A SOUTHERN NIGERIA GENERAL HOSPITAL</p> <p>Methodology</p> <p>Pregnant women with no formal education were assisted with local dialect by the research assistants.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Statement could be made more clear as follows <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"> At what time was the blood collected? Were the blood samples collected fasting or random? <p>Results</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 <7.0g/dl).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The foregoing could be re-cast as follows <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 <7.0g/dl).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> More than two thirds of the respondents (61.51%) were married. <p>Two thirds of the 265 is about 177. Thus, 163 or 61.5% cannot be two thirds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Table 2: Family and nutrition characteristics of the respondent <p>This title does not adequately capture all the information in the table, so it could be modified as follows;</p> <p>Table 2: Some practices and nutritional characteristics of the respondents</p> <p>Footnote under Table 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> ***228 of the respondents were para ≥ 1 <p>Modify to</p> <p>***228 of the respondents had parity ≥ 1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7.1% prevalence of HIV is frightening, so it should not be trivialized as 'only.' <p>References</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Check the following references; there are some errors 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	24,25, 26, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 44. 10. Some errors have been corrected using track changes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Overall recommendation Subject to the correction of the minor errors pointed out, the paper can be accepted	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nsiah Kwabena Kwame
Department, University & Country	Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana