



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Hematology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AHRJ_49361
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Anemia among Pregnant Women Registered at Antennal Clinic of Ondo Specialist Hospital, Ondo state, Nigeria
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>)

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>To authors, I have some advice.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. You stated that previous data showed that anemia was more frequent in the third trimester than second trimester; however, the present data showed different result. You stated that this is a grave condition/situation for the women's health. Then, please state why the present study showed different result from the previous ones. Generally speaking, hypervolemia (hemodilution) is greatest at 28-34 weeks and thus "dilutional anemia (pregnancy anemia)" occurs in these weeks, which is the third trimester. Do you mean that the study population suffered anemia not due to hemodilution? You also mentioned malaria. The readers are confused what type of anemia was the target in this study. You even did not measure serum Fe or TIBC or ferritin and thus the etiology was obscure. You cannot retrieve such data because the study has finished. Then, you had better discuss the possible reasons/etiology of the anemia that you observed here. Needless to say, the meaning and treatment are completely different according to the anemia-etiology; malaria, dilutional, or iron deficiency. State the situation, please. 2. You used "present tense" and "past tense" at the same time. Fundamentally, you had better use past tense consistently because the study has finished. Present tense is used only to describe "definite fact" (The earth revolves around the sun). This is related with number 1 advice. Original paper must have something new. What are the new points here? State them in first, second, third manner. If there is nothing new and this study ONLY confirmed the preexisting data, then it is OK, but please state it definitely. I mean that you must write if 1) there were something new, or 2) no new information and you have only described this area situation. Describe 1) OR 2) definitely. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Shigeki Matsubara</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Jichi Medical University, Japan</i>