

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	MS_JPRI_78733
Title of the Manuscript:	The association of anemia with vitamin D deficiency among patients visiting King Khalid General Hospital in Majmaah, Saudi Arabia
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript is interesting, is clear, well described and covers the general format. It is an interesting descriptive study, since it evaluates the degrees of anemia in an adult population of the referred hospital, through the quantification of several parameters of the blood count, highlighting the evaluation of vitamin D. However, it is necessary to reinforce some points that I consider important to improve its quality.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In the abstract it is necessary to describe the abbreviations Hb, MCV, MCHC, MCH, MCH, Hct, WBC, RBC, and Plt), although it is done in the introduction they must indicate the abbreviations used at the beginning of the manuscript on a separate sheet of paper. 2)-Write in all the manuscript et al., in italics (<i>et al</i>). 3) The introduction is extensive, so I recommend reducing and using information in the discussion. 4) In the results section it is necessary to modify Table 1, I suggest placing the mean and standard deviation in a single column to avoid using double columns. Were there significant differences? Indicate them if there were any. 5) The sample size is not homogeneous since the number of women is almost double that of men. I suggest to be the number of men and women equal in the study and check if the differences they report are the same. 6) Discuss more specifically and deeper the results obtained, these are done in a lightly manner. 7) In addition, it is essential to update their references, because the most recent one is from 2018. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Anabel Jimenez-Anguiano
Department, University & Country	Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana-Iztapalapa, Mexico