Review report

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE
	[Note: Please write the responses to each point here mentioning line number(s). You must change the manuscript as per your response.]

A. Mechanical review

Date sent to author: **26-Jun-24**	Date: **29-Jun-24**
1. The title page must have word counts.	Unanswered
2. The abstract is not formatted.	Unanswered
3. Tables/figures must appear at the end of the manuscript.	Tables/figures have been placed at the end of the manuscript.
4. No data availability statement.	Unanswered
5. References are not prepared using the Vancouver style.	References have been prepared according to the Vancouver style.
6. Please merge Tables 1 and 2.	Unanswered
Date sent to author: **29-Jun-24**	Date: **29-Jun-24**
1. The title page should also have a word count for the abstract.	Word count has been mentioned on the title page.
2. The Abstract should be on a separate page. Its background subsection must have a statement of objective(s).	Abstract have been revised accordingly.
3. The highlights page is missing.	Highlights have been added.
4. The data availability statement is also missing.	Unanswered
5. The Funding statement should be revised according to the Journal's style.	The funding statement has been revised as per the journal's style.
6. I asked you to merge Table 1 with 2.	Tables 1 and 2 are merged.
7. You have not entered all authors' information into the submission platform.	Unanswered
Date sent to author: **30-Jun-24**	Date: **30-Jun-24**
1. Yesterday's point number 4 was on the data availability statement. You have not added it.	Data availability statement have been added.
2. The highlights should be after the Abstract page.	Highlights have been placed after the abstract page.
3. You have not entered all the authors' information into the submission portal.	Author contributors have been added.

B. Technical review

ROUND 1	
Reviewer's name: **C**	
ORCID: -	
Date assigned: **4-Jul-24**	
Date submitted: **25-Jul-24**	
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s? **No**	
Do you wish to be disclosed to the author? **No**	

REVIEW COMMENTS		AUTHOR RESPONSE [Note: Please write the responses to each point here mentioning line number(s). You must change the manuscript as per your response.]
Comments sent to author (Date: **19-Aug-24**)		Date: **19-Aug-24**
	Score	[Note: Please response if the score is below 6]
How would you rate the originality and depth of the manuscript?	6	-
Is the manuscript written in a scholarly manner?	5	We revised the manuscript in a scholarly manner.
Does the manuscript have the potential to make a valuable contribution to the world of knowledge?	7	-
Does the manuscript meet ethical standards?	6	-
a. Overview of the Manuscript: The research idea is good. An extensive literature review is needed to compare the present results.		-
b. Major Points: There are grammatical errors and a scarcity of adequate literature.		The manuscript has been revised following the comments.
Reviewer's recommendation: **Revisions required**		
Reviewer's name: **Najnin Akhter**		
ORCID: **0000-0002-5560-849X**		
Date assigned: **4-Jul-24**		
Date submitted: **13-Jul-24**		
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s? **No**		
Do you wish to be disclosed to the author? **Yes**		
	Score	[Note: Please response if the score is below 6]
How would you rate the originality and depth of the manuscript?	7	-
Is the manuscript written in a scholarly manner?	6	-
Does the manuscript have the potential to make a valuable contribution to the world of knowledge?	7	-
Does the manuscript meet ethical standards?	3	We described the ethical issues in detail in the methods section which may reflect the standard practice now.
Overview of the manuscripts: This cross-sectional study was focused on the differentiation on IDA and thalassemia traits in pregnant patients on the basis of Ret-Hb. It involved 90 pregnant patients who were divided into three groups- 30 patients with IDA were in group I, 30 patients with thalassemia trait were in group II (only patients with beta-thalassemia trait were found) and 30 healthy individuals were in group III. Ret-Hb was measured among the selected patients using the flow cytometric method.		-
1. Please mention the study period in the abstract.		A study period has been added.
2. What were the criteria for selecting the patients in the abstract?		Selection criteria have been added in the abstract (only inclusion criteria. Both inclusion and exclusion criteria have been added in the main text)
3. Please rewrite the conclusion in the abstract. The submitted one is more looks like a recommendation of the present research rather than a conclusion (Lines 47-48).		The conclusion has been rewritten (Lines 50-52).
4. Highlight: Please rewrite the highlighted points because 1st four have the same meaning.		"Highlights" has been rewritten.

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE [Note: Please write the responses to each point here mentioning line number(s). You must change the manuscript as per your response.]
5. Introduction: 1. Lines 64-65, please check sentence making.	Lines 64-65, the sentence has been rewritten.
6. Please check the place of research again because there are dissimilarities between the abstract and methods (Line 108-109)	The place of research has been corrected both in the abstract and method. (Line 108-109)
7. Please mention the sampling technique.	The sampling technique has been mentioned.
8. Lines 125, please check sentence making.	The sentence has been corrected.
9. The selection of subjects was not clear (Line 111-114), how many subjects were examined by the researcher to ultimately reach 30 population in each group.	The selection of subjects has been mentioned. (Line 111-114)
10. Please write a footnote for Table 2 (Line 306-312)	A footnote for Table 2 has been written. (Line 306-312)
11. Please redraw the Figure 1 (blur image quality)	Figure 1 has been redrawn.
12. Discussion: Better to rewrite the discussion because now it only represents the results of other authors. Results are important but it may be written in a descriptive way. Need to compare the results of yours with the findings of other authors.	The discussion has been rewritten according to the review.
13. Statistical analysis: A descriptive analysis was performed for all data. The mean values were calculated for continuous variables. The quantitative observations were indicated by frequencies and percentage. One way ANOVAs test followed by the Bonferroni test was used to compare continuous variables between iron deficiency anaemia and thalassemia trait. Chi-square test was used to compare categorical data. Sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV) and negative predictive value (NPV) were calculated predicting IDA and thalassemia trait. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve analysis was performed to identify the cut-off value for predicting IDA and thalassemia trait. A *P*-value <0.05 was considered significant. Please describe how and where the above-mentioned Statistical analyses were done.	The method and the site of statistical analysis were mentioned in the research.
Reviewer's recommendation: **Revisions required**	
Executive Editor's name: **M Mostafa Zaman**	
ORCID: **0000-0002-1736-1342**	
Please reduce the word count of the Abstract by making the Background shorter.	The word count of the Abstract was reduced by making the Background shorter.
1. Present results in the form of mean (SD), not mean ± SD all over the manuscript.	Results were presented in the form of mean (SD)
2. Avoid acronyms in the Highlights	Acronyms were avoided in the Highlights
3. The introduction is given in a long single paragraph. Please divide it into small thematic paragraphs.	The introduction has been divided into small thematic paragraphs.
4. Statistical analysis: ANOVA has been correctly used to compare three groups. However, the use of Bonferroni test as a post-hoc test is not correct. Kindly use the Tukey test	Tukey test was done.

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE [Note: Please write the responses to each point here mentioning line number(s). You must change the manuscript as per your response.]
instead. Bonferroni is used for the correction of p values for multiple testing.	
5. Results and tables: Table 1: Do not use acronyms. Add P values obtained by ANOVA to each row. Results should be given up to one decimal point.	Results and tables were corrected according to comments. A combined P value was added in each row.
6. I suggest dropping the ROC curve. It is very unstable. Describe the findings in the text.	The ROC curve has been dropped.
Executive Editor's decision: **Revision required**	
ROUND 2	
Handling Editor's name: **Mohammed Saiful Islam Bhuiyan**	
ORCID: **0000-0001-8532-4992**	
Comments sent to author (Date: **19-Aug-24**)	Date: **5-Sep-24**
1. Line 40-41: The number of patients "30 patients" has been mentioned in the methods so you can omit repetition in the result section. "P value was statistically significant <0.001". No need to mention it, you can just place the p-value within a bracket.	Line 40-41: "30 patients" has been omitted from the result section. The p-value has been placed in the bracket.
2. 45: "Ret-Hb showed a significant difference to distinguish thalassemia trait from IDA' this line can better be written as "Ret-Hb can differentiate thalassemia trait from IDA in pregnancy and before going to further expansive confirmatory test, Ret-Hb could be used as an important diagnostic tool".	Line 45: The conclusion has been rewritten.
3. Line 57: "Our sample size is small, and it is not multicentered" Avoid highlighting your limitations rather mention your findings. You can write: "We found that reticulocyte haemoglobin content can successfully detect and differentiate IDA and thalassemia trait in pregnancy".	Line 57: Findings have been added according to the review in highlights.
4. 182: Iron deficiency anaemia and thalassemia trait in pregnancy can have an adverse maternal and fetal outcome", please cite the proper reference.	Line 182: Citation has been given.
5. 184: "In our study, Ret-Hb was significantly (<0.001) lower in patients of IDA than those of (thalassemia)? trait".	Line 184: The line has been corrected.
6. Line 189: "In patients of IDA, the reason for low Ret-Hb is due to reduced iron stored in IDA". You can avoid the repetition of the word "IDA".	Line 189: The repetition has been avoided.
7. Line 209-11: The conclusion is the repetition of the conclusion of the abstract in lines 45-47. Please rewrite it.	Line 209-11: The conclusion has been rewritten.
8. Reference: Please ensure the uniform referencing according to journal rules.	Uniform referencing has been given according to journal rules.
Handling Editor's recommendation: **Revision required**	

C. Editorial decision	Date: **10-Sep-24**
Final editorial decision: **Accepted**	