



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/IJTDH/1268
Title of the Manuscript:	<i>Environmental Influences in Non-Obese Women with History of Recurrent Pregnancy Loss</i>
Manuscript received on (Date)	
Review comment submitted (Date)	



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	It is an interesting study that needs major revision/improvement	
Specific comments:	1) Language revision is highly recommended 2) Non-obese women could be indicated as normal-weight women 3) Please revise (add) spaces before/after gaps. 4) Why only progesterone among hormones was measured? Heavy metals influence also the levels of other hormones (see lines 51-52)	
Title and abstract		
Introduction	5) 'significant public health concern could be changed to 'public health concern' 6) Sentence on lines 41-42, please rewrite 7) Line 50, sentence is to understand 8) Line 66, sentence seems to miss some words 9) The aim of the study (line 69) was really to understand the interactions? Maybe rather investigate the correlations?	
Review of literature (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)		
Materials & methods (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	10) Instead of 'indices' use characteristics, parameters or variables (also in Tables)	
Results & discussion (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	11) Integrate the subtitle 'results' into the part of Discussion, to have all the text under one title 'results and discussion'. 12) Move the Tables from the text to the end of the manuscript and refer in the text to them (in the brackets). 13) Discuss better the study findings, what do they mean, not just present them. 14) Tables. Remove the column of T-test values, they are not	



SDI Review Form 1.5

	needed (you already mention in the text that T-test was used).	
Conclusion	15) Conclusion is not very well presented, a bit messy	
References		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Signe Altmäe
Affiliation:	Competence Centre on Reproductive Medicine and Biology, Estonia