

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_127319
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge of Pregnant Women on the Use of Iron and Folic Acid Supplements and Diet in Iringa Municipality, Iringa Region
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The topic focuses on improving maternal health by addressing the use of essential supplements like iron and folic acid. It has practical implications for enhancing health outcomes for pregnant women and their babies. The regional focus on Iringa Municipality offers valuable, context-specific insights. It can inform better health policies and interventions tailored to the local community. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Consider reframing the title to: Knowledge on the Use of Iron and Folic Acid Supplements and Diet Among Pregnant Women in Iringa Municipality, Iringa Region	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<p>Methodology Method of data analysis (content analysis) kindly expand how it was applied to the data or mentioning key themes. Sample size for the study was not captured in the abstract,</p> <p>Results Reflect more results from your findings in the abstract</p> <p>Conclusion The sentence, "The study concluded that most of the respondents were aware of IFAs and diet through health workers during clinics during three month of pregnancies," could be clearer. It seems to suggest that awareness happens only after three months, but the point about supplements being needed earlier could be emphasized better.</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Subsections are appropriate</p> <p>Manuscript structuring:</p> <p>Literature review Summarize your literature review under few subheadings</p> <p>Methodology: "Interviews and questionnaires were used for data collection. Qualitative data were analysed using content analysis." This section is very brief and lacks details about the study design (e.g., qualitative approach),</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>sample size, or study population. Including this would enhance comprehensiveness.</p> <p>Results: The results highlight:</p> <p>Awareness levels of IFA and diet (87% awareness).</p> <p>Sources of information (mainly health workers).</p> <p>Benefits (87% aware of maternal and fetal benefits).</p> <p>Adherence challenges (76% adherence, citing nausea, loss of appetite, and misconceptions).</p> <p>The results are detailed and well-structured but could benefit from summarizing key numbers to improve readability.</p> <p>Conclusion: "The study concluded that most of the respondents were aware of IFAs and diet through health workers during clinics during three month of pregnancies which is not proper since the supplements should be taken after one month of conceiving..." The conclusion is informative but could be rephrased for clarity and precision. It also needs a stronger emphasis on the study's implications.</p> <p>Recommendations: The recommendation is broad but relevant. Specific strategies, such as integrating IFA education into early antenatal visits, would make it more actionable.</p>	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is technically sound because it has a clear objective focused on addressing a critical public health issue. It employs appropriate qualitative methods, including interviews and questionnaires, with a sufficient sample size of 100 respondents. The study is contextually relevant to Iringa Municipality and aligns its recommendations with WHO guidelines. It is well-structured, identifies key barriers to IFA adherence, and includes ethical approval, ensuring validity and reliability of its findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Some references are outdated, your topic is a global trending topic and there are a lot of work on similar field, kindly use 2019, 2020 upwards. Your references is reflecting more of in-text citation e.g Mulamba, M. et al. (2014). Follow the recent Apa format for referencing authors	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dauda Rifkatu Samaila
Department, University & Country	College of Nursing Sciences, Nigeria