



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJR2H_46048
Title of the Manuscript:	An Open Label, Multi-centric Study to Assess the Safety and Efficacy of Sodium Feredetate (Fedate syrup) within 21 days in Patients with Iron Deficiency Anemia
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Rewrite the section "Results" of the abstract. Beware to redundancy as a similar sentence are present both in "Materials and Methods" and "Results" sections</li></ul> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- You said: "<i>In 1992, World Health Organization estimated global prevalence average of anaemia at 56%.<sup>[1]</sup></i>" Find a more recent reference</li><li>- You said: "<i>The Sub-Saharan Africa is one of the most affected regions - with more than half (53.8%) of children under - 5 years old suffering from anaemia and in Africa, 57.1% of pregnant women are anaemic.</i>" Add reference</li><li>- Make short sentences in the third paragraph of the introduction</li><li>- Add references to the first seven sentences of the fourth paragraph</li><li>- Delete paragraphs 5 and 6. It sounds nonsense to me. Please properly rewrite the introduction by clearly stating the problem you wanted addressed and a clearer state of the art as well. In addition, you have to specify the objective of the study.</li><li>- The last paragraph of the introduction to be part of the methodology</li></ul> <p><b>Materials and Methods</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- It is not clear why did you choose the &lt; 10 mg/MI threshold for inclusion of your participants. Please properly specify that in order to make clearer your methodology to scientists who are not familiar with domain</li><li>- Properly outline the meaning of abbreviation such as IM or IV within the paper</li><li>- There are lots of confounders that may explain your results on Hb as you did not follow participants anytime. You just got information at Days 0 and 21. In other words, how confident are you on the reliability of your findings as between days 1 and 20 participants were at home or any other place different from attended clinics. So, certain of these participants could have self-medicated with plants known as improve the iron level.</li><li>- Which type of Student t test did you use to make comparison?</li><li>- Which software did you use to perform statistical analysis?</li></ul> <p><b>Results</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Transform Figures 1 and 2 into Tables. It would be better</li><li>- Delete the Table 2 and interpret the results in the literal manner</li><li>- Properly specify how did you define categories such as "fair", "poor" or "excellent"</li></ul>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>to categorize the effectiveness of your tested iron supplementation approach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Most of severe events were reported in which group (once or twice a day)?</li> <li>- Delete Figure 3 and make text</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b> To be shorten!!!!</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>There are so many limitations related to the way of writing paper, methodological aspects, interpretation of data and discussion. So, this paper is not clear and not well written. No methodological rigour and a lots of problems in English language especially grammar. Limitations of this study are irreparable although reviewed.</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>Yes, although authors outlined they had had ethical authorizations, they did not present ID number of ethical clearance.</p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Kojom Foko Loick Pradel</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>The University of Douala, Cameroon</i></b>