

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_112911
Title of the Manuscript:	Hematological Insight: An Epidemiological Study on Anemia Prevalence in Diverse Blood Groups within the Population of Hyderabad Sindh
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>Study on prevalence of anemia is important. However, correlation with the blood groups to establish an ethology needs further research.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>A reference number 4 - pathophysiology and management of iron deficiency anemia in pregnancy does not fit in well with the study for normal population.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. It is mentioned as a cross sectional study in the paper which proves the comparative analysis of the anemic and non anemic group. It would be appropriate to use the word comparative analysis of anemia prevalence with non anemic individuals.</p> <p>2. Larger sample size would have given better conclusive results.</p> <p>3. In criteria of inclusion lower indices were considered as iron deficiency anemia.</p> <p>4. Mendtzers index would have been better indicator for exclusion of thalassemia minor which was not mentioned in the study.</p> <p>Observations are suggesting in males O blood group has shown more non anemic individuals but would require more number of study subjects to conclude further and in females across all blood groups anemics have outnumbered non anemic subjects.</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:	Gugloth Shireesha
Department, University & Country	Pratima Institute of Medical Sciences, India