

## Review Comments

**Manuscript Title: Vitamin D deficiency and risk of hair loss: Knowledge and practice of adult female population in Saudi Arabia, 2020**

This research aims to assess the knowledge and practice of Vitamin D its sources, deficiency effects and especially targeting the hair loss among young Saudi females, with a good sample size of > 800 is a not a new but important area of research especially in view of social practices and high prevalence of Vitamin D deficiency in the region.

However, the manuscript needs amendments as mentioned below, before its publication.

### **Comments:**

#### **1. Abstract:**

1.1 Method section under the Abstract part, should include the method of accessing the knowledge and practice (How it was assessed or measured e.g. with use of a predesigned questionnaire)

#### **2. Background:**

2.1 Page 2, Last two line of the second para of Background part mentions, another short-term study of medical students at King Fasil..... found that 96% of 95 student (95 males and 103 females) - this part is unclear, what the author means by 96% of 95 students and how it comes to 95 males, 103 females?

2.2 The reference cited for this part (ref. 13) also needs to re-checked, cited reference (no 13) is about the study done among health care practitioners for Vit D supplements in infants and not among medical students.

2.3 Page 3, second para in the Background part, line 9, Additionally, in another study, almost 19% of Saudi girls were found ..... 67% were observed to have the direct sun exposure, while 75% were reported to ..... The total percentage exceeds 100 – author need to relook or explain further

2.4 Page 4, Journal manuscript format has no “review literature” section, so important points from the Literature review can be merged briefly with background or discussion parts and stick to the journal manuscript format of Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion and Conclusions.

### **3. Aims and Objectives:**

- 3.1 Page 6-7, Can be revised in a journal manuscript format and some of the steps can be merged together, especially those mentioning sample size like, sample size was determined using Epi Info 7 (version needs to be mentioned) using CI of 95%, margin or error 5%, expected frequency of 83% ..... like that.
- 3.2 Page 8, paragraph 2 (data management ...) what author means by quantitative categorical variables?
- 3.3 Page 8, Knowledge scores and practice scores calculated for this study has any reference available then should be cited.

### **4. Results**

- 4.1 On page 10, second para mentions that 488 (60.2%) correctly know at least one source of Vi D without giving any wrong answer, however sunlight is answer given by higher proportion (77.5%) of participants than that – can author explain more on that
- 4.2 Similarly, in para 3, 398 (49.1%) knew at least once cause of Vit D deficiency without giving wrong answer and lack of sun exposure was the answer given by higher proportion (77.9%) of participants than that.
- 4.3 In same line para 3, 379 (46.8) and Osteoporosis (72.8%), hair loss (70.2%) and depression (63.1%) are higher proportions of answers by participants.
- 4.4 Data on relationship of Vitamin D deficiency and hair loss is not included in the tables, which is one of the study objectives and can be included in the table also.

### **5. Discussion**

- 5.1 On page 16, para 3, first line, need to add scores after practice – overall practice score of Vitamin-D