

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78218
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence and Determinants of Anaemia among Reproductive-aged Women in Ethiopia: A Nationally Representative Cross-sectional Study
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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What about the other regions? 2. Would you mind if you list out specifically who are they, please? 3. Have you seen the prevalence of anaemia among women in Amhara region was (17.58%) which is less than the prevalence of anaemia among women in Benishangul-Gumuz region (19.48%)? 4. The odds of being anaemic for women from Afar region was increases by a factor of 2.439 as compared to women from Tigray region, held constant the rest of independent variables in the model. 5. Thus, please re-interpret it in the similar manner. 6. Since your response variable is one, you cannot say multivariate; rather your model has to be named as Binary Multiple Logistic Regression. 7. How do you recommend FP, since it was not significant in your study? 8. Please try to recommend based on your study finding to the specific concerning organ in order to either reduce or resolve the problem of mothers in the reproductive age group in Ethiopia. 9. It's highly recommended that every study must applied to the socialite benefit. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All the regions of Ethiopia were listed. When the 2016 EDHS data was collected, the total number of regions/provinces was 11. 2. They are Tigray, Affar, Amhara, Oromia, Somalia, Benishangul-Gumuz, SNNPR, Gambela, Harari, Addis Ababa, Dire Dawa 3. Yes I saw it and I have corrected it. 4. I rewrote it. 5. I did it 6. It is not multivariate. I said multivariable which implies as several independent variables included. But, Multivariable does not imply many dependent variables.(I have seen many literatures) 7. I recommended 'The respective bodies should also provide women family planning programs'. This is not direct finding of the study. The reason I could recommend this was that in this study as the parity (the number of children ever born) increases the odds of being anaemic for the women increases. Since there was no finding regarding family size, now I have deleted this recommendation. 8. I corrected 9. I agree
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please add more Keywords. 2. This is not the right place to write the Analysis. 3. Please specify it as contraceptive usage status. 4. Please, replace it with β 5. Please, replace it with S.E. (β). 6. It's better to make the significance indicator on the test statistic which is Wald. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.I have added 2.I took it to the end of the Result section 3. I corrected 4. I did it 5. I did it 6. The wald value is there. But, the significance is determined using the p-value. (In our case Sig. is same as p-value).
Optional/General comments	No Comment.	

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)	The data used for this study was publicly available secondary data. For this reason, no ethical issues was required.(Under Ethical approval, I said Ethical approval was not necessary as this study used the 2016 EDHS publicly available secondary data which is available on the DHS website (http:// dhsprogram.com)).