

Review Form 3

Book Name:	Disease and Health: Research Developments
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_4167
Title of the Manuscript:	Meconium Proteins Involved in Iron Metabolism
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript makes a significant contribution to the scientific community by providing novel insights into the regulation of iron metabolism in the intrauterine environment. The study's focus on meconium, a unique biological material specific to fetal development, offers a new perspective for understanding the complex interplay of iron transport and storage proteins during pregnancy. The identification of strong correlations between specific proteins in meconium, such as haptoglobin, transferrin, and NGAL, suggests their collaborative involvement in iron homeostasis within the fetus. Furthermore, the study's findings provide valuable information about the potential role of ceruloplasmin in regulating neutrophil activity in the intrauterine environment.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Meconium Proteins Involved in Iron Metabolism" is a bit generic and doesn't fully capture the specific focus of the study. It could be improved by highlighting the key findings or the unique aspect of the research. "Meconium Proteins as Potential Biomarkers for Fetal Iron Status and Intrauterine Inflammation" "Ceruloplasmin Affects Neutrophil Behavior in the Womb: Insights from Baby's First Poop"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract should clearly state the research gap the study aims to address. Example, "The lack of specific biomarkers for fetal iron homeostasis limits our understanding of its regulation during pregnancy." Expand on the key findings beyond just listing the proteins and their correlations. Eg. highlight the significance of the high ferritin concentrations and the potential implications of the ceruloplasmin-neutrophil protein associations. Briefly mention the potential clinical implications of the study's findings. The abstract could be streamlined by removing some redundant information, such as the detailed descriptions of each protein's biological functions. These details are better suited for the introduction or discussion sections. Can be restructured in a logical flow, Background: Briefly introduce the research gap and the importance of fetal iron homeostasis. Methods: Briefly describe the study design, participants, and methods used. Results: Summarize the main findings, including the key correlations observed. Conclusions: Briefly state the significance of the findings and their potential clinical implications.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is a valuable contribution to the field of fetal iron metabolism. It provides novel insights and highlights the potential of meconium as a source of biomarkers for fetal health. However, addressing some points could further enhance its impact and scientific rigor. 1. The manuscript acknowledges the limitation of not determining the iron saturation of the proteins, which could provide valuable insights into their functional roles. 2. While the manuscript discusses the potential clinical implications of the findings, it could be strengthened by further exploring the potential use of meconium proteins as biomarkers for fetal iron status and intrauterine inflammation. 3. The manuscript suggests further research to clarify the biological significance of high meconium ferritin concentrations. It would be beneficial to expand on these suggestions by outlining specific	

[Review Form 3](#)

	research questions and potential approaches.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient in number	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The article demonstrates a good understanding of the subject matter and presents valuable research findings. However, the points to consider:</p> <p>i. While the article is generally written in an academic tone, there are instances where the language is a bit too informal or conversational. For example, phrases like "as far as we know" and "Interestingly" could be replaced with more formal expressions.</p> <p>ii. There are a few minor grammatical errors and punctuation inconsistencies throughout the article. Carefully proofread the text to ensure accuracy.</p> <p>iii. Some sections could be made more concise and easier to understand. For example, the discussion section could be more focused and less repetitive.</p> <p>With the above revisions, the article would be suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>This manuscript is a valuable contribution to the field of fetal iron metabolism. It provides novel insights and highlights the potential of meconium as a source of biomarkers for fetal health. The study is well-designed and the results are presented clearly.</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Eliminate unnecessary repetition in the text, the discussion section could be more focused and less repetitive.• Consider revising the language to improve clarity, conciseness, and academic tone. Some sentences are quite long and complex.• Focus on the most important findings and their implications in the discussions• Provide more specific suggestions for future research.• The references are sufficient in number, but some could be updated if available. Consider incorporating more recent references to demonstrate a stronger connection to the current state of knowledge in the field. <p>The manuscript has the potential to be a valuable contribution to the field, but it needs significant revisions to address the weaknesses.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sunil Abraham
Department, University & Country	Singapore