Innovative Journal of Pediatrics
Volume 32 · Issue 2 · e120633

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Comparison of Surfactant Administration Efficacy in the Treatment of Respiratory Distress Syndrome in Preterm Neonates: Aerosolization Versus INSURE

Ali Reza Sadeghnia, Zarineh Mahjoor, Behzad Barekatain

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
31 Oct 2021	4 Jan 2022	6 Feb 2022	10.5812/ijp-120633

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Maryam Saeedi, Mirhadi Mousavi 2
2 **Revision 1** 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5

1 Original submission

2 comments · 17 Nov 2021 – 20 Nov 2021

Maryam Saeedi Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 17 Nov 2021

Although a very good study has been conducted, the following points need to be addressed:
Given that your research was a clinical trial, the method of randomization and preparation of the two groups for blinding are not described in detail in material and method. Please add additional information.
The Results are very brief. There is no information about the improvement in a/APO2 before and after surfactant therapy, although this is presented in the table.
The qualitative comparison of the need for a second dose of surfactant, invasive mechanical ventilation, pneumothorax, BPD, IVH, nCPAP duration, and death in the case and control groups should be mentioned, although it was not statistically significant.
In the discussion, other research, especially on non-invasive methods similar to the method used in the study, should be mentioned, and the results should be compared with those of the current study.
Please add the limitations and strengths of your research to the discussion.
This study is acceptable with minor revision.

Mirhadi Mousavi Reviewer

ACCEPT 20 Nov 2021

Hello. A good title has been selected for the study. You have put a lot of effort into the study, which deserves thanks.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
While pointing out that a very good study has been done, it is necessary to pay attention to the following points for correction:
Regarding that your research was a clinical trial, in material and method, the method of randomization and preparation of two groups for blinding is not mentioned in detail. Please add additional information.

Answer: We changed that section and highlighted according to your comments.

The Results are very brief. There is no information about the improvement of a/APO2 before and after surfactant therapy, although presented in the table.

Answer: We added all these sections to the manuscript and highlighted according to your comments.

the qualitative comparison of the Need for a second dose of surfactant, Invasive mechanical ventilation, pneumothorax, BPD, IVH, nCPAP Duration, Death in case, and control groups should be mentioned. Although it was not statistically meaningful.

Answer: All of them were added to the manuscript and highlighted according to your comments.

In the discussion, other research especially non-invasive methods similar to the method used in the study should be mentioned and the results should be compared with the current study.

Answer: This study was the first one in its scope to be completed. Other related studies are being conducted simultaneously. However, none of them has been published to the date.

Please add the limitations and strengths of your research in the part of the discussion.
This study is acceptable with minor revision.

Answer: Limitations and strengths of the study were added and highlighted.

Reviewer 2:
Hello. A good title for the study is selected .You have put a lot of effort into study, which deserves thanks

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.