



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_29225
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE OF ANAEMIA AMONG CHILDREN ATTENDING PAEDIATRICS DEPARTMENT OF UDUTH, SOKOTO, NORTH-WESTERN NIGERIA
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>)



SDI 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	Not certain why your definition includes non-pediatric levels – your article is about paediatrics so just stay to that defining to reduce confusion. There are a number of grammatical issues – please ensure that you use the abbreviations correctly – i.e., HB versus Hb --- watch use of ; versus : ---- I feel the statistical consideration was done at a descriptive only level and did not fully explicate the data that would have shown trends (beyond a simple mean and sd (std)) The use of graphical representation of the male/female or age groupings would have been much more meaningful and demonstrative of a depth of consideration. This appears non-scientific and more as a simple reporting. I would strongly caution the authors one (on) their 'rationales' for the lower incidence rate – which were not linked to their data set (or at least what is reported) – so it almost appears unsubstantiated at best and self-fulfilling at worst. I feel that the lack of a full consideration of the existing literature is a fundamental issue. There are many papers –both evidentiary and grey literature– which would have brought more content and critique to this effort. The description of the blood testing techniques would more appropriately be in	Is was quoted by Jiya et al., 2014, that the paediatrics age in Usmanu Danfodiyo University, Sokoto, North Western Nigeria is 0 – 15 years, please. Noted and would be corrected Data analysis and data presentation are not conventional, interest and decision of one person may not be the same with others. Recall that this journal is international, please. Noted and would be corrected This is not clear /uncommon.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	a table rather than text. This is critical and is the grounds for my recommendation. 18/28 references are 10 years older or more – this is not acceptable – especially in reference to nutrition. Your reference list is not consistent in terms of format. Ethical Issue- It is unclear what assent was used with the children – especially the older children in this regard. Further it is unclear if there were charges related to the testing – and if so who bore those charges. Further, were the parents told of the results???	Noted The children were recruited in the hospital when they came for medical attention. The hospital charges were taken care by the author on a subsidized rate agreed by the hospital management and the results were taken back to the parents free of charges. The Questionnaires given to the parents contained the informed consent forms to be filled by the parents of the children (see attached)
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		