

### 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	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The present study addresses an important aspect of maternal health during gestation. Knowledge, attitude and practice assessment remains important for identifying the factors impeding the implementation of the tailored interventions of public health importance and/or the unhealthy lifestyle practices that may be potentially associated with occurrence of anaemia. In this regard, the present study is relevant.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The term 'management' should be omitted.	
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.	As the study aimed to determine the factors associated with attitude and practice for anaemia in late pregnancy. This should reflect in the abstract. The study didn't determine the factors for anaemia management.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	In the methods section, further sub-sections such as variables should be mentioned.	
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.	Root cause analysis for anaemia remains incomplete without laboratory and clinical investigations for anaemia. A KAP study can be useful to underscore the underlying obstacles in the implementation of the tailored interventions of public health importance and/or the unhealthy lifestyle practices that may be potentially associated with occurrence of anaemia. In this regard, the present study is relevant.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	For comparison of the study estimates with Indian population a new study can be cited. <i>Purakayastha R, Mahajan H, Verma RB, Chaturvedi SK, Kumar D, Das VR, Sinha SK, Kunal K, Lal CS, Pandey K. Prevalence of anaemia in pregnant women among rural population of Kurhani block, Muzaffarpur district Bihar: A cross-sectional Primary Health Center based study. Journal of Scientific Research. 2022;66(5).</i>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English language needs to be improvised.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why only 34 – 38 weeks of gestational period was selected?</li> <li>• Systematic random sampling method should be elaborated.</li> <li>• Sample size calculation must be elaborated with sufficient assumptions and measures.</li> <li>• Univariate logistic regression analysis results are presented. Didn't find a Chi-square test results.</li> <li>• There appears predisposing factors having mutual linearity e.g., low educational level, low family income, unemployment, etc. The model selection for multivariable logistic regression analysis must be revisited. It may be done using stepwise selection method.</li> <li>• What was the reason for selecting the tolerance level of 0.1 in multicollinearity test?</li> <li>• Proportion of participants in different gestational period should be presented.</li> <li>• While most (83.8%) had no haematological disease, mention the status in remaining study population.</li> <li>• While majority (67.8%) were said to be early bookers, why it has been associated with poor attitude?</li> </ul>	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Sanjay Kumar Chaturvedi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>