

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_111838
Title of the Manuscript:	STATUS OF OXYGENATION IN PAEDIATRIC ACUTE RESPIRATORY DISTRESS SYNDROME WITH PRONE VENTILATION VERSUS CONVENTIONAL SUPINE VENTILATION IN A TERTIARY CARE HOSPITAL OF KOLKATA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Status of oxygenation mostly presented in term of PaO2 or SaO2 rather than using indices used in this manuscript. OI, OSI, PFR, SFR mostly used for representing the severity of hypoxemia in each patient which have other variables to consider, such as mean airway pressure or FiO2.</p> <p>2. Methods need to clarify more about how patients were selected to be in prone positioning or why all the 40 patients were prone even they have maintainable oxygenation. Results should provide some important numerical data.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. The main confounding factors to this manuscript are the settings of ventilator, severity of ARDS in each patient, site of SpO2 monitoring. The validity of the result analysis is also questionable due to unidentified statistical method used. The description in this section is the general principle of statistics, not specifically identified to this manuscript.</p> <p>5. PALILIC criteria for ARDS in children must be included. This criterion mentioned about OSI and SF ratio uses. The authors of this manuscript should explain why they still need to verify the correlation between OI vs. OSI, PFR vs. SFR.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes. Please kindly check terms and definitions uses in the manuscript and clarify them appropriately in the context in each section.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tayatorn Sudsuansee
Department, University & Country	Taksin Hospital, Navamindradhiraj University, Thailand