

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_94698
Title of the Manuscript:	Diagnostic utility of Bedside Lung Ultrasonography in Neonates with Respiratory Distress
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajpr.com/index.php/AJPR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. In the clinico-radiological diagnosis (Gold standard) there were 11 cases labeled as normal. What is normal mean here? Does it mean these babies did not have RD? If so why they were included? The x-ray could be normal, but if baby had RD then it should be labeled as mild RDS, or TTNB as per the clinical condition. So, the complete result will change, and it needs a serious thought.</p> <p>2. What was the time difference between x-ray and LUS?</p> <p>3. As you have mentioned in the limitation, surfactant has a role on the lung status. Did all the x-ray and LUS were done before surfactant?</p> <p>4. Who did the LUS?</p> <p>5. Was all the x-ray were reported by radiologist? And is he different from the LUS reporter?</p> <p>6. Provide a table of LUS diagnosis. 30 had RDS, 53 had TTNB, what about the other cases in LUS diagnosis.</p> <p>7. Table: 9.....mention the number and percentage of cases with these findings.</p> <p>8. Discussion part should not contain new result data. The LUS findings in RDS and TTNB should be mentioned in result section first.</p> <p>9. Discussion part needs more improvement, just saying our result are same adds no value. If same why?.... if different why that different needs to be explained.</p> <p>10. Cohen's kappa shows agreement between 2 observations, whats the significance of p-value here?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. Full forms should be used at first appearance of words like HMD, TTNB.</p> <p>2. DLP is a main criteria in diagnosis of TTNB, which was not mentioned in methodology or result section, it appears directly in the figure and discussion part. It needs more emphasis for TTNB diagnosis.</p> <p>3. How many babies got delivery room CPAP? as it has effect on the lung condition and SA score.</p> <p>4.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Gouda Ankula Prasad Kartikeswar
Department, University & Country	MJM Hospital, India