

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_104495
Title of the Manuscript:	Electrical Cardiometry versus Echocardiography in Assessment of Hemodynamic Status in Preterm Neonates with Septic Shock
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The manuscript is important for scientific community, the title is suitable. However, the abstract is confuse; information is missing in the introduction to contextualize the objective of the study. It is necessary to better describe the methodology. The type of statistical analysis is not adequate for the purpose of the study. The discussion is very long and the text lacks critical elements that better connect the study findings with what the literature says. References are not cited correctly</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, there is a need to review the adequacy of the text to the English language	
Optional/General comments	please see comments throughout the article	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gabriela Araujo Costa
Department, University & Country	Pontificia Universidade Catolica de Minas Gerais, Brazil