

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_88184
Title of the Manuscript:	Weekly iron supplementation in 2-year-olds is effective in combating anemia
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:

(<https://www.journalajpr.com/index.php/AJPR/editorial-policy>)

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	Discussion, paragraph 3: “was an increase in the anemic”; should read “was a non-significant increase in the anemic”. Discussion: there should be a paragraph discussing potential weaknesses of this manuscript. 1. The prevalence of anemia appears to be significantly higher in Group A compared to Group B, which could influence the results of this study. 2. This study examines blood hemoglobin levels which are assumed to be a reliable marker for iron deficiency. 3. Why do the authors believe that weekly iron treatment was ineffective in a large percentage of anemic children?	Alteration made as requested in the manuscript. A paragraph on the potential weaknesses to this study has been added at the end of the discussion section.
Minor REVISION comments	Introduction, paragraph 2: “Iron is the most found metal”. Please consider: “Iron is a widespread metal”. Introduction, last sentence: “the homeostasis and development of”. Please consider: “the development and homeostasis of”. (If there is no development, there will not be any homeostasis”). Results: the authors state in the Methodology that they are presenting intention to treat results. If the authors have the per protocol data, I would suggest that it be added to the manuscript since it should further support their conclusion about the importance of iron supplementation. The Introduction describes importance of iron deficiency while the Discussion describes the importance of anemia. Perhaps the authors can better match these sections (usually the Discussion explains how the manuscript has improved the information presented in the Introduction).	Alteration made as requested in the manuscript. Alteration made as requested in the manuscript. This information has not been included as it would create an excessive number of tables; furthermore, this study was approved and conducted as intention to treat In the discussion section we have changed the term to iron deficiency anemia.
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	