

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_124295
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors Influencing The Attitude and Practice Towards Anaemia Management Among Pregnant Women Attending Primary Healthcare Clinics in the Kuala Langat District (FAP-PW): A Cross-Sectional Study.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>		
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>		
<b>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.</b>		
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>		
<b>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.</b>		
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>		

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>It is a cross sectional study on 395 pregnant women regarding their knowledge and attitudes related to anemia in pregnancy.</p> <p>The sample size is reasonable and the article is well written with adequate tables and statistical analysis. The authors observed poor attitudes among pregnant women with anaemia. The study adds to the knowledge in this important public health issue</p> <p>The authors should make following corrections before it can be considered further</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1 They should add strengths of the study</li><li>2. The should add limitations of the study like it was only observational study with no lab tests.</li><li>3. The authors should give a paragraph about prevalence of anaemia in pregnancy globally and in India as per NFHS 5 and discuss the reasons for high prevalence in India and how to reduce it.</li></ol> <p>To the editor After the corrections it can be published</p>	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>J. B. Sharma</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>All India Institute of Medical Sciences, India</b>