

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In the abstract section, can you include why this research is important to do?</li><li>• In the abstract section, please summarize no more than 250 words.</li><li>• In the keywords section, please do not abbreviate LUS, TTNB, and RDS?</li><li>• In the introduction section, please add gaps in this manuscript.</li><li>• In the introduction section, references related to this research, such as research similar to this one, may be added.</li><li>• Please include the number or identity of the code of ethics letter obtained from the Institutional Ethical Committee and Scientific Committee.</li><li>• If possible, please replace citations with older years and can use citations above 2011.</li><li>• In the first paragraph in the discussion section, please add reasons for choosing the research sample in the form of Neonates with gestational age 28 weeks to 40 weeks.</li><li>• In the discussion section, please give reference about why this research use grading is defined by using Modified Silverman Andersen?</li></ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	This manuscript overall is good, only need a minor correction.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This manuscript overall is good, it can be published after doing revision.	

### PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hanik Badriyah Hidayati
Department, University & Country	Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia