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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for asking me to review this very interesting and well-written paper. I have some minor suggestions to make:

Background:
You need to be consistent about using 'Iron deficiency' or the abbreviation ID. You also need to include (ID) in brackets after 'Iron deficiency' the first time of use.
Some countries, e.g. UK do not recommend additional iron requirement during pregnancy (due to amenorrhoea and increased absorption), see COMA 1991. A discussion of this would be helpful in the introduction.
An explanation of anaemic & non-anaemic iron deficiency is needed.

Methods:
Is KK an abbreviation? If so, write in full first.
Is natural conception an inclusion criteria? (mentioned in results). If so, it needs to be indicated on the methods section.

Results:
see comment about natural conception above.

Discussion:
299-300: Most anaemic women already had iron deficiency anaemia in early pregnancy - it is also likely that many women were anaemic prior to conception. Iron deficiency in women of child-bearing age is well documented and some discussion of this issue would be helpful here.
313-314: Can you expand on the differences in dietary practices in these ethnic groups?
320-323: Are iron supplements well absorbed? Could this be an explanation for poor iron status, despite supplementation?
Further discussion about how these findings should influence current practice would be helpful here, particularly from a public health perspective. What needs to be done to improve iron status of pregnant women/ women of child bearing age at a population level?
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable
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