



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_45726
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the factors associated with birth asphyxia among the new-born infants at a rural hospital in Bangladesh
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>This is a well-designed and reported study on factors influencing birth asphyxia in new-born infants. I would recommend to review the manuscript according to the following points in order to improve its educational value for a possible publication in AJRNH.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Some limitations of the study are presented at the end of the discussion section, I would encourage the authors to create a separate section to expand on these limitations. For instance the authors should clarify how they managed to exclude patients with genetic disorders, and mention that despite sporadic genetic disorders are oftentimes discovered later on during infant life, they can nonetheless have a role in explaining a low APGAR score at birth (ref: D'Arco F, et al. Neuroimaging Findings in Lysosomal Disorders: 2018 Update. Top Magn Reson Imaging. 2018 Aug;27(4):259-274.). 2) I would encourage to mention whether signs of maternal infections were associated or not with respiratory distress in neonates. Authors should highlight that this is a major cause for low APGAR score and new-born respiratory distress syndrome (ref: Ganau M, et al. Challenging New Targets for CNS-HIV Infection. Front Neurol. 2012 Mar 23;3:43.). Furthermore, it would be worth mentioning that even in babies with good APGAR score at birth, pyogenic infections contracted at time of delivery might induce respiratory distress at any given point during the first week of neonatal life and this is a factor of major concern in rural areas (ref: Ganau M, et al. Ring-enhancing lesions in neonatal meningitis: an analysis of neuroradiology pitfalls through exemplificative cases and a review of the literature. Quant Imaging Med Surg. 2018 Apr;8(3):333-341.) 3) Finally, I would ask to discuss the importance to exclude from analysis babies with neonatal diagnosis of posterior fossa tumours. These lesions in fact can cause brainstem compression and be associated to alterations of the respiratory drive (ref: D'Arco F, et al. Differential diagnosis of posterior fossa tumours in children: new insights. Pediatr Radiol. 2018 Dec;48(13):1955-1963.). As explained by D'Arco et al. usually the identification of those tumours is made by neonatal ultrasound followed by Magnetic Resonance Imaging. Since this study was conducted in a rural hospital, the authors should mention whether attempts were made to exclude babies with CNS tumours from their study, or at least clarify that in a future trial attempts will be made to exclude them from enrolment. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. limitations are included and points raised by the reviewer were also considered. 2. It is not relevant to the research that carried out so it was not considered. 3. It is not relevant to the research that carried out so it was not considered.
Minor REVISION comments	N/A	
Optional/General comments	See above	

PART 2:



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

	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>	