

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Immunology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJI_126317
Title of the Manuscript:	The Gravity of Vitamin D Deficiency and Miscarriage in Women.
Type of the Article	

**General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>  
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Vitamin D and fertility issues are a subject to debate. Many studies have been conducted about the causal relation of Vitamin D and infertility and about the treatment perspective of vitamin D. I dislike the manuscript for several reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The study doesn't have a control group.</li><li>- If there is a causal relation between low levels of vitamin D and recurrent pregnancy loss; there should be a physiological and/or pathological explanation for this. Additionally this relations had to be detailed in the discussion part.</li><li>- The way the study has been written is not appropriate neither. Eg; a discussion can not start with "other" ....</li></ul>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
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.	Yes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I think that this study need major revisions; let's say it should be conducted again with a control group, needs a novel statistical study and a new discussion part with precise subdivisions, clear explanation of what the study found, a meticulous resume of other studies and possible explanation of logical basis of the relation on debate (vitamin D and pregnancy loss).	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments	The language needs a correction by native speakers.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Burcin Balci
Department, University & Country	Istanbul University, Turkey