



| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJRIMPS_40206 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Oral versus Parenteral Iron Supplements: Which is better? |
| 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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) |
|--|--------------------|---|



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> | <p>The title of the article is suggesting usage of parental iron supplements in a more broader setup as appropriate, it would be prudent to change the title to give a message that in the said study the choice was confined to puerperium/ postpartum state (the inclusion criteria of the study). Although by extension that choice may be made by clinicians in other indications as well, the title is misleading to suggest a broader category of patients at the outset. Hence, the authors may change the title more appropriately to indicate the study population. Like adding a word to the end—Postpartum/ puerperium.</p> <p>Line 74 says, “tolerated margin of error within 95,” at that rate, the sample size needed, would be only 2 and not 386. Further, it would be of value for medical students and researchers while reading this article to put the population size, which in case of Sahiwal district is 2,517,560 (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sahiwal_Districtas). That along with confidence level (in this case 95%) and Margin of error (in this case 5%) decides the sample size. With these three data above (using online calculator https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/sample-size-calculator/) the sample size is 385. And the chosen number 386 for the study is a good thing such that the groups can be equally divided. Necessary changes may be made in lines 72 through 74.</p> <p>Secondly, a statistical significance is shown at day 45, between group A and B vide TABLE II, although accurate, when only three parameters are included for chi-square test by the 2*3 table, the result is not statistically significant. Such an analysis can be quickly done by this online tool (http://www.socscistatistics.com/tests/chisquare2/Default2.aspx). That is to be expected as with oral preparations, as replenishment of iron store would take more time. In any case as your discussion itself gives more importance to HB. “The primary objective of this study was to confirm if there is a significant difference in the hemoglobin concentration achieved as a result of two different therapeutic approaches,” the complete story should include with this additional set of the data analysis. Statistical analysis was done for all the three parameters (excluding ferritin), at day 6, 14 and 45 show the p-value as follows: 0.94, 0.55 and 0.78. As is evident in all the three-time frames the clinical parameters are not statistically significant.</p> <p>Thus, the statistical significance seen with the inclusion of Ferritin is not clinically significant. And this word of caution in the discussion merits mention. (INCLUDE THE QUOTED LITERATURE WRITTEN BELOW FROM LINE 153 ONWARDS) “At day 6, 14 and 45 although statistical significance is seen between group A and B when comparing all the parameters, no such significance is seen in all the time frame when ferritin is excluded from the comparison. So for clinical purposes, the difference between the outcome of two groups is not significant at day 6, 14 and 45.” This additional information is very crucial to let the reader have a balanced view. This balanced representation of the data also adds legitimacy to the “question mark” in the heading of the topic.</p> <p>(THIS INFORMATION BE PLACED FROM LINE 163 ONWARDS)</p> <p>Further, as there are statistically significant adverse events in the IV Iron group, p-value: 0.046 in Table III, the reader would be appropriately forewarned that the choice of IV iron comes at the cost of adverse effects and without any additionally clinically significant benefit.</p> <p>More references may be included such that this new statistics makes more sense and gives value to the paper under consideration.</p> <p>The conclusion also needs editing in light of this new statistics. “IV iron though successfully replenishes iron stores and is a helpful measure in individuals who are not compliant with oral irons, for most clinical purposes oral iron and IV iron therapeutic options do not differ statistically, and the best decision needs to be made on a case to case basis using clinical judgment and prudence.” The language in the quoted text may be modified through out to suit the pattern of the overall document while sending the revised manuscript.</p> | <p>Thanks a lot for considering my paper for this much comprehensive review. Your descriptive remarks have really helped. I have included all compulsory revisions to make my paper worthy of this valuable journal.</p> |
|--|---|--|



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>Many grammatical errors needs mention, a thorough grammar check needs to be made before sending a revised manuscript.</p> <p>Few of the more obvious grammatical error's are pointed herein: In abstract, taken orally in treatment, make it "in the treatment" Anemia in postpartum period, make it "the postpartum period" (on two occasions in the abstract) During August to November, make it "from August to November" Mean corpuscular volume and (mean corpuscular volume, and) Within confidence level (within the confidence level)</p> <p>Introduction Line 15 to 21 needs to be considered for wordiness. (consider fragmenting the sentence) Line 40 second-generation formulations is clearly an improvement (remove the word clearly, second-generation formulations is an improvement.) Line 54 During months of August and September (during August and September) Line 58 during first week of puerperium (during the first week of puerperium)</p> | <p>This is a great favor from you. Reviewing my manuscript in this much detail has helped me make it worthy of a science journal. I have revised the manuscript and improved grammar. All the mistakes pointed out by you have been corrected in Version 1.</p> |
| Optional/General comments | <p>The topic looks good and timely, the study has been done in a meticulous manner. If it can be revised appropriately, it can have a great publication value.</p> | <p>I have revised the paper appropriately. I thank you for such a helpful review once again and request for approval of my paper for publishing.</p> |