Review of: "Statistical Overview of Prevalence of Anaemia with Associated Socioeconomic and Demographic Factors in Nigeria"

Frederick Nchang Cho

Infectious Disease Laboratory,

Faculty of Health Sciences,

University of Buea,

P.O Box 63 Buea – Cameroon

Sunday, March 17, 2024

The Editorial Board Member,

Qeios

Dear Dr. Gabri,

Reviewer Report

It is with pleasure that I submit a review report on, "Statistical Overview of Prevalence of Anaemia with Associated Socioeconomic and Demographic Factors in Nigeria".

It is a nice piece but plagued with methodical and grammatical errors. I read through the downloaded PDF, made comments, and have attached a PDF document for the authors' attention.

Comments

General

The paper is plagued with a lot of grammatical errors and poor use of tenses.

Abstract

1. The abstract is not structured and lacks recommendations.
2. No key words at all; four to five are good for a publication.

Introduction

1. Abbreviations, even those that are conventional like HIV and WHO, as well as others should be defined before being used for the first time.
2. The introduction fails to mention figures of haemoglobin for children 0 – 5 years in Nigeria.
3. The introduction also lacks the inclusion and citation of literature.
4. The study makes mention of Kebede et al. BMC Pediatrics (2021); the name of the journal should be removed.
5. Despite numerous studies on the prevalence of anaemia, … authors did not cite these numerous studies.

Research Methods

1. This section lacks Study Design and Study Area.
2. The data collection time frame is not well defined; it should include the starting month and the ending month.
3. Please add the "Definition of Concepts" area. In this area, define the Dependent and Independent variables. To this, it seems there is a mix-up in the definition of Dependent and Independent variables.
4. Chi-square and regression formulae were presented; I see no need for these as calculations were done with the STATA software. To add, I did not see where the Chi-square test was used.
5. The study population should be clearly defined; are they children, women, or the general population?

Data Analysis and Results Discussion

1. Data analysis should be included in the Research Methods section, while the Results and Discussions sections should be presented separately.
2. The authors said, "The South West having the smallest number of respondents (9.73%)". I am thinking that the study should be re-designed. All the regions should have equal proportions, and the data collection period should be extended for 2021 and 2022.

Discussions and Conclusions

1. The discussions were not clear, lacked citations, and references.

- There was no Strengths and **limitations** section.
- The references are not enough.

Note: The PDF format of the paper has been uploaded as an attachment for authors to keenly follow comments and recommendations for correction.

Yours sincerely,

Frederick Nchang Cho