

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80711
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Anaemia in Females of Reproductive Age Group
Type of the Article	Review 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>

Review Form 1.6

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>Discussion</p> <p>Pg 2 : <i>"the use of certain iuds (IUDs) for contraception: need to be spell out IUD.</i></p> <p>Pg 2: This is statement is not clearly written. Please rephrase <i>If a woman had two or fewer interval pregnancies, she is more likely to develop anaemia during pregnancy.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Are pregnant with many children.</i> • <i>Are vomiting a lot because of morning sickness.</i> • <i>They don't eat a lot of iron.</i> • <i>Are carrying a lot of weight before you get pregnant.</i> • <i>Have a history of anaemia prior to becoming pregnant.(7).</i> <p>It is good thing that the review was divided under relevant subheadings to make it easier to read and understand. However, the authors did not use recent and relevant literature available to compile all of the information in their review. I suggest the authors should give more viewpoints on each of the subheading discussion. (Pg 3-4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cause of anaemia Is not focused to the topic of "Anemia in females of reproductive age group". The pertinent problems were not clearly discussed and debated. • The diagnosis of anemia is not thoroughly discussed and out of date. • The outcomes of anemia should be focus on the effects to mother and newborn/fetus during pregnancy and postpartum. • The treatment and prevention anemia are poorly written. Avoid using the word "you or your" in the statement. Suggest to rewrite in scientific way. <p>Pg 5, 6: Figure 1 and 2: Were not mentioned & elaborate in the text. If the picture is taken or modified, the authors should give acknowledgment with proper citation</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>This review article is an interesting topic that looked at the compilation of available necessary information related to prevalence of anemia in females of reproductive age group.</p> <p>In general, the sentences were fair, however there are many spelling and grammatical errors. I strongly suggest this paper to be sent for proofreading service to minimize grammar errors. All factual statements correct however not adequately supported by recent citations.</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>The abstract was not accurately summarize the contents of the review, searching method was not mentioned, The "description" should change to discussion .Please follow the journal format. Suggest to rephrase this sentences more scientifically written. <i>"It can make you feel restless, reduce your quality of life, and make it more likely that your HIV infection will worsen."</i> Conclusion is poorly stated.</p> <p>Methods</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	The authors did not mention how the review is conducted. Could you maybe describe briefly how the authors do the review and selection of the articles, as well as years covered? References: Please follow the journal format.	
Optional/General comments	Key words: , suggest to add "anaemia" "females" "reproductive age" Introduction Please have your sentences and spelling checked by a proof-reader. Please elaborate on the rationale for this review by highlighting the research gaps.	

PART 2:

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

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nur Karyatee Binti Kassim
Department, University & Country	Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia