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Reviewer’s report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions

1. In this revised version, authors have done regression analysis. Thus, in results section (both in abstract as well as in the main text) the results of the regression analysis have to be mentioned (not the results of the Chi squared tests).

And the associations can be described together with the direction of association (as Odds Ratios have been calculated) rather than just mentioning the raw variables such as age, education, living area etc. However, should make sure to mention the significant values of the regression analysis (not the results of the Chi squared test).

2. While interpreting the results (ie. The OR values), the correct terminology to use is “likelihood”, not “risk”.

3. In the reference section, there are inconsistencies. Authors should adhere to one referencing style as per the journal guidelines.

- Minor Essential Revisions

Overall

1. Despite highlighted in the previous review, throughout the article the authors have used different spellings for the most important variables of the study, viz “anaemia” and “Haemoglobin”, which have to be corrected promptly.

2. There are grammatical as well as spelling errors throughout the article which have to be promptly addressed.

Methods

3. Study population - It’s not correct to mention, “The study population consisted of 224 pregnant women”. Because, 224 is the sample size, not the total number of subjects in the population.

4. Sample size – The formula has to be corrected as,

\[ n = \frac{Z^2 \, p \, q}{r^2} \]

And also mention the prevalence value which was used for the calculation.
(Though 32% was mentioned in the reply to reviews, it wasn’t mentioned in the main text)

5. Sampling technique – Is it purposive or consecutive?

6. Statistical Analysis – “A significance level of 0.05 was considered as proper” This is not a valid statement.

Results

7. When presenting the results in some instances only the absolute number or the mere percentage was mentioned. (both the absolute number and the percentage should be given)

8. “Mean (+/-SD)” should be corrected as “Mean (SD)”, both in the text as well as in numerical values.

9. In the tables, the p value for each variable has to be mentioned rather than just mentioning that it is not significant. Together with the p values the Chi values could have been provided. Though the authors have mentioned they have corrected this, they have not done that in the text.

10. As a limitation of the study, the inability to generalize the findings has to be highlighted (as a non-probability sampling technique has been used).
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