

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Biochemistry Research &amp; Review</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_129661
Title of the Manuscript:	Iron Status of Pregnant Women at different Trimester in Nsukka, Enugu State, South East, Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Iron deficiency is still a leading cause maternal morbidity and mortality especially in the developing countries. Therefore estimation of the extent of iron deficiency is important so that adequate measures can be taken for improving the iron and hence haemoglobin status of pregnant women. Hence, this is a very important topic of research for scientific community.	We Sincerely acknowledge the Reviewers comment concerning the importance of this research topic to developing nations like Nigeria and we are grateful .
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes Title is appropriate	We agree with the comment on the title of this work and are ready to learn more about research title in future.
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>Abstract</b> of this article has 316 words. This is a bit lengthy for abstract. Although major features of this study have been summed up in the abstract section, it has been written in the form of a continuous paragraph instead of separate headings like background, objective, methodology, results and conclusion. In addition, there are 7 key words given but they have not been arranged in alphabetical order.	We agree with the comment of the reviewer that the abstract is length. We have obeyed the reviewer by revising the abstract and sectionalized it as instructed. The key words have been reduced to five in alphabetical order as instructed.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes it is scientifically correct.	We appreciate the comment of the reviewer that our manuscript is scientifically correct and commend the untiring efforts of the reviewer.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Although there is a long list of 127 references but all are mote than 5 years old. No latest reference has been included. More than 50 percent of references are more than 10 years old.	We accept the reviewer's comment concerning old references and have made appropriate corrections in the text and list of references too.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality needs improvement	We are grateful for the reviewer's comment on quality of English and conducted overall revision.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	INTRODUCTION has 654 words. English needs improvement. References are more than 5 years old. MATERIALS AND METHODS section does not mention study design and sampling technique used. Also methods have a lot of details about equipment, instruments, and chemical reactions that do not correlate with the study RESULTS have 9 tables and there is repetition of results in texts and tables. Tables need formatting. DISCUSSION has repetition of results. Also, references are very old.	Quality of English has been revised, Introduction has been improved on and references too.  The study design was cross-sectional research design and sampling technique was simple random sampling.  The authors reformatted all the tables and put them in the right places. Discussion has been revised as instructed by reviewer and we are grateful for all the errors found and the patience of the reviewer to see that we improve in the academic world.

Review Form 3

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>	