Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Immunology**
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

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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.	This manuscript highlights the association between Vitamin D deficiency and miscarriage, a crucial area for improving maternal health outcomes. I like that it focuses on an accessible and potentially modifiable factor, offering practical implications for reducing miscarriage risk through vitamin D supplementation.	
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.	The abstract of the article is informative but could be more concise and focused. Here are my suggestions for improving it: 1. Add methodology, how Vitamin D levels were measured and criteria for selecting participants. 2. Add a sentence on the implications of the findings for clinical practice	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Almost ok but in conclusion section adding a subsection for "Future Directions" would help highlight the potential areas for further research.	
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.	The manuscript appears scientifically robust in terms of its overall aim to explore the correlation between Vitamin D deficiency and idiopathic miscarriage, addressing an important gap in reproductive health research. The study design involves a substantial sample size, with clear efforts to exclude potential confounding factors such as infectious agents, autoimmune disorders, and other physical conditions. However, improvements in the statistical analysis presentation and more in-depth explanations of the exclusion process would further strengthen the scientific validity of the study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient and include a mix of recent and relevant studies.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language quality of the article requires significant improvement. While the overall content is understandable, there are several grammatical errors, and issues with word choice that affect readability. Phrases like "the loses of pregnancy" should be corrected to "the losses of pregnancy." Additionally, there are some inconsistencies in terminology, such as using both "abortion" and "miscarriage" interchangeably without clear justification. Improving sentence structure, maintaining consistent terminology, and ensuring a formal tone throughout the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Gurmeet Singh**
Department, University & Country	**ISF College of Pharmacy, India**