

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_106977
Title of the Manuscript:	Determinants of Iron and Folic Acid Supplementation Adherence among Women of Reproductive Age in Kilifi South Subcounty, Kilifi County, Kenya.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. This is a very interesting and well structure manuscript, important for the scientific community</p> <p>2. Title is adequate</p> <p>3. Abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure is outstanding</p> <p>5. There is a key issue with side effects that needs to be corrected</p> <p>6. References are acceptable</p> <p>Sample size calculation by Fisher is inadequate for the statistical approach used on the regression analysis, as such I understand that it was performed to account for the chi square. As the samples are not huge, I would recommend using Fisher's exact instead of Chi square. If sample size calculation for the regression was intended, recommended reading follows: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6422534/</p> <p>Also, when describing it the authors mention p value to define a group expected response probability, that's inadequate.</p> <p>Avoid 'various ways' on data collection section 2.11 for interviewing techniques, if possible, describe how interviewers where trained and in what techniques where used Its fundamental to annex both the unstructured guide toll and the questionnaire for review.</p> <p>Sample size was around 324 patients as per calculations, how many where effectively enrolled? Add to results.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Attention to typos. On sampling techniques substitute interior for countryside.</p> <p>For figure 1 I would recommend a stacked column/ bar or even pizza or chart as it performs better to present proportions over 100%</p> <p>Was side effect questioned in any questionnaire? Its missing from both regressions and that in itself is weird as it's a key factor to adherence</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Side effects either need to be evaluated or the lack of such evaluation explained before further consideration can be given. That is the only main factor holding this article back. With corrections, I strongly recommend it for publication.</p> <p>After corrections please review discussion and conclusions in accordance. This sections need reviewing but that will depend on the steps taken on the issues raised here for adjustment.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Vitor Augusto Q Mauad
Department, University & Country	ABC Medical School, Brazil