

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_128019
Title of the Manuscript:	The relation between Inotrope uses and Occurrence of Intraventricular Hemorrhage in Preterm Neonates
Type of the Article	Review Article

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses a significant topic in neonatal care by exploring the relationship between inotrope use and the occurrence of intraventricular hemorrhage (IVH) in preterm neonates. It highlights critical insights into hemodynamic management and the risk factors associated with IVH, providing valuable information for clinical practice. The findings could potentially inform treatment protocols to minimize IVH risk and improve outcomes in this vulnerable population. Its relevance is heightened by the ongoing need to optimize neonatal care strategies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, " <i>The relation between Inotrope uses and Occurrence of Intraventricular Hemorrhage in Preterm Neonates,</i> " is suitable as it clearly reflects the focus of the study. However, for clarity and grammatical correctness, a slight revision is suggested: Suggested Title: " <i>The Relationship Between Inotrope Use and Intraventricular Hemorrhage in Preterm Neonates.</i> "	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a concise summary of the study's focus. However, it could benefit from the inclusion of the following: 1. Specific study objectives or hypotheses. 2. A brief mention of methods or key findings to give a better overview. 3. Recommendations or implications of the findings.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound and well-supported by relevant literature. It effectively discusses the mechanisms and risk factors associated with IVH in preterm neonates. However, some sections, such as the explanation of inotrope mechanisms and the link to IVH, could be elaborated for more depth.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally sufficient and recent, with many cited studies from the past five years. However, incorporating more recent meta-analyses or systematic reviews could enhance the reference list. For example, a recent study on inotrope effects in neonatal care could be included for added context.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript's language is adequate for scholarly communication, but minor improvements are needed for grammatical consistency and fluency. For instance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace "the significantly risk factors" with "significant risk factors." Correct phrases like "haemorrhage occurs, which may proceed into the ventricles as intraventricular haemorrhage (IVH)" for redundancy. Proofreading by a native English speaker or a professional editor would improve overall readability and polish. 	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Shahab Masoumi
Department, University & Country	Vanderbilt University Medical Center, United State