

Editor's Comment:

Preliminary Editorial Decision on Manuscript Number 2018/AJPR/46567

I have studied all the attached files.

Reviewer Moh raised some critical comments which were neither addressed in the revised paper nor the feedback to reviewer's comments.

1. The title and conclusion of the paper did not reflect what was actually done. The study design is not appropriate for the conclusions authors reached. It is only randomized controlled studies that can be used to reach that type of conclusion. There is no scientific evidence that the effects authors reported were from use of MgSO₄.
2. The statistical analysis done in table 3 is not clear. What variables were compared in the table?

Author's Reply:

1.
 - i. The title has been modified to reflect the AIMS and OBJECTIVES of the interventional study with magnesium Sulphate among severely asphyxiated neonates over one year period.
 - ii. No it is not Randomized controlled study, the study design is "prospective interventional study of randomly selected asphyxiated neonates delivered or referred to our centre with the first seventy two of delivery. We gave all the selected patients with Severe perinatal asphyxia magnesium sulphate.
 - iii. There are few study-results that claimed so, such 1. Gathwala et al REF12, Kumar et al REF27, Bhat et al REF29, Gathwala et al REF30. The first three were randomized controlled trial, while Gathwala REF 30 and Study by Sreenivasa et al and Savitha et al were direct therapy with magnesium Sulphate and documenting the observation.
2. Usually, when an investigator formulate study, "the results try to answer the questions raised in the aims and objectives and the medical biostatistician try to do the analysis based on study objectives. So in this case the statistician did the permutations. However, since the question was raised about the plausibility of the table (Table 3), we edited and presented it as frequency table to "PRESENT THE OUTCOME OF SEVERELY ASPHYXIATED WITH MAGNESIUM SULPHATE". Editor Sir, you may edit the manuscript as you deem it fit for succinctness and content.
3. The new corrections are in PINK MARKINGS

NB: The editor Sir, we undertook the study to observe the effect of treatment with magnesium Sulphate of neonates with severe perinatal asphyxia.

The parameters used were:

1. Early commencement of breastfeeding
2. Resolution of the encephalopathy

3. Restoration of primitive reflexes

4. We follow the patients up to 3 months, ideally followed up to 18 months to see the achievement of milestones among these patients studied. However we only observed them to 3 months due logistics reasons.

We believe there is need for further longitudinal prospective randomized preferably placebo controlled study for minimum of 3 years if we can get sponsorship.

We are believe, we have created an avenue for further debate on the subject matter.

Once again thank you for giving consideration to our manuscript.