



**Paper: “Prevalence and Correlation of Vitamin B12 and Vitamin D Levels Among Jordanian Patients”**

**Submitted: 25 November 2024**

**Accepted: 25 February 2025**

**Published: 28 February 2025**

Corresponding Author: Firas Alsoleihat

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n6p109

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Parfait Alohoutade  
University of Abomey-Calavi (UAC), Benin

Reviewer 2: Bousakhria Mahmoud  
Faculté de Médecine de Constantine Université, Algeria

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

-----  
Reviewer A:  
Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

Yes, I agree that the title is clear and is in line with the content of the article.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The structure of the summary is respected but I have included two comments. One on the term “representative sample” and one on the nature of the medical data used in the study.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Yes there are some grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. However, this does not prevent us from understanding the content of the document on which I have focused all my attention.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

No, the methodology used is not well structured. This part must be reviewed in the form of material and methods as follows: study area, sampling, data collection, material, data processing and analysis.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body of the document, especially the discussion part, must be reviewed. The results were presented but the absence or presence of significant differences was not explained. Which does not allow understanding. The literature is also not well provided and the references are quite old. I would also like, if possible, to mention proof of the opinion of the ethics committee.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

I think the conclusion is too short perhaps there are not many results but this part needs to be rephrased.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The references are relevant but quite old and very short. We need to dig deeper to enrich the discussion.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

I suggest that the author considers the recommendations. The study is relevant but it is necessary to document the causes of these deficiencies, diet, social status, medications, dietary practices and ignorance. These causes bother me too much.

---

-----  
Reviewer D:  
Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----  
**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

the title is vast, preferably to say: Prevalence and correlation of vitamin B12 and vitamin D levels in a sample of Jordanian patients.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

yes, the abstract clearly presents objects, methods, and results

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

There is no

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Yes

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

Yes.

But in the discussion, it must be removed: Implications for Public Health

This study's high rate of vitamin B12 and vitamin D deficiency highlights Jordan's need for focused public health initiatives. Among the methods to remedy these shortcomings are:

1. Public awareness campaigns: teaching the general public the value of getting enough vitamin D and B12 from their diets and supplements.
2. Nutritional Supplementation Programs: Putting in place initiatives to give supplements, especially to high-risk populations like the elderly, pregnant women, and people with limited sun exposure.
3. Dietary Modifications: Promoting the intake of foods rich in Vitamin B12 and Vitamin D, such as dairy, eggs, fish, and fortified cereals.
4. Sun Exposure Guidelines: While taking into account cultural and religious customs that restrict sun exposure, encouraging safe sun exposure practices to boost endogenous Vitamin D synthesis

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

yes

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

yes

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Very interesting article, well written, corresponds to the publication standard, but needs a title revision and removed the chapter: Implications for Public Health

-----

-----  
Reviewer B:  
Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title is generally clear and informative. Might consider adding a hospital-based study or a cross-sectional study to make the title more informative.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract of the manuscript does a good job of summarizing the study. There are, however, too many specific numerical values that may overwhelm the reader. Have the main takeaway findings emphasized more clearly in the abstract section.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

The language is clear and academic, but there are minor grammatical inconsistencies.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Methodology section are well-described and structured.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body of the paper is clear, but there are minor grammatical errors. The introduction and discussion contain long, complex sentences that could be simplified for better readability.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusion effectively summarizes key findings.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

In-text citations are properly used. The references list is well-structured but needs slight reformatting to comply with ESJ guidelines e.g., journal article titles should be in sentence case, and DOI/URLs should be provided where applicable.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*



[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Revise and resubmit after addressing the above points.

-----