## BSMMUJ-65670 Hemophilia in a newborn without family history: A case report

## Akter S. (shahanahfrmc@bsmmu.edu.bd)

Executive Editor's comments (12-Mar-23)		Author's response (21-Mar-23) Please respond to all comments from the editor and reviewer(s). Indicate the line number(s) of the manuscript where the changes are done.	
1.	Please follow the admin checklist attached for revising your manuscript. All points must be addressed. World count and section headings are a major issue.	1.	Manuscript has been prepared following the instructions of admin checklist.
2.	There is no title page. The title could be "Neonatal hemophilia in a patient with duodenal atresia: A case report".	2.	Given the title page.
3.	There are no highlights. Please provide in bullet points.	3.	Given Highlights in bullet points in a separate page.
4.	4. Use Introduction, Case Presentation, Case Management, and Discussion subheadings for the main text. The Discussion should have a Conclusion at the end.		Revise as per guidance.
5.	5. Fig 2 has the photo of the baby, whose identity should be hidden. Have you taken written consent from the parents of the child to publish her/his photo?		Photo has been removed.
6.	Remove et al from the reference list. List all authors.	6.	Given the name of all authors in the reference (Page 10).
Ed	itor's Decision       a. Minor revision         b. Major revision       √         c. Reject       ✓		

<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	s		Author's response		
Date review assigned 01-Dec-22			Date sent to author	12-Mar-23	
Date review returned 04-Mar-23			Date received from author	21-Mar-23	
Reviewer name, affiliation, email, ORCID	Prof. Ranjit Ranjan Roy Dept. of Paediatrics, BSMMU ranjit.bsmmu@gmail.com				
Conflict of interest of No the reviewer					
Please write Yes or No			Please write a response if the re No. You must change the manu response. Mention line number	script as per your	
1. Is the research question or study objective clearly defined in measurable terms?		Yes			
2. Is the abstract accurate, balanced and complete?		Yes			
3. Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question or achieve objective?		-			
4. Are the Methods described sufficiently to allow others to repeat it?		-			
5. Are the operational definitions and ascertainment of key variables given adequately?		-			
6. Are the outcomes cl	·	No	Hemophilia can occur without f explained the outcome.	amily history. Clearly	
7. Are statistics used a described fully?	ppropriately and	-			

8. Do the Results addr question or objectiv		-				
9. Are the tables and f appropriate to addr research question?	ess the objective or	No	Page 5 , elaboration of pictures added, Title for table added			
10. Does the Discussion of the paper?		Yes				
11. Are the strengths ar addressed?		No	Actually it is a case report, so to comment regarding strength and limitations, I have to research on a large scale			
12. Are the conclusions	justified by the results	Yes				
13. Are the references u appropriate?		No	Given the up-to-date references.			
14. Is the standard of w acceptable for publi		No	Improved the writing as advised.			
15. <b>Descriptive comments</b> to the authors (Divide it into MAJOR and MINOR points).			Respond and reflect it in your manuscript. If you refute, justify your argument using references. Mention line numbers.			
<ul> <li>Major points:</li> <li>1. Although the title indicates the duodenal atresia, the text description inadequately covers it. It is not mentioned anywhere.</li> </ul>			<ol> <li>Major points:</li> <li>Actually, hemophilia in newborn is highlighted, duodenal atresia additional findings. So I change the title accordingly.</li> </ol>			
Minor points:						
<ol> <li>DIC in hemophilia needs explanation with appropriate reference in case presentation and Discussion. It appeared suddenly on Page 5 Line 13 without any previous link.</li> </ol>			<ul> <li>Minor points:</li> <li>1. In 6th Page regarding DIC has written.</li> </ul>			
2. References must be well formatted			<ol> <li>Reference has been formatted according to the journal's guidelines.</li> </ol>			
16. Reviewer's	d. Minor revision					
Recommendation	e. Major revision	$\checkmark$				
(Tick mark on the	f. Reject					
open boxes to the right)						

## Second round

Executive Editor's comments (29-Mar-23)	Author's response (30-Mar-23)	
We have edited and formatted your manuscript for publication in the BSMMU Journal. However, it is yet to meet the criteria for a case report. Kindly address the following points:		
1. Word count for the main text must come down to 1000. Currently, it is 1412.	1. Reduced the word count to 1000 words.	
2. A case report can have two visuals maximum, but you have three (one table and two figures). Could you reduce it to 2?	2. Reduced the figures to 2.	
3. You have not submitted your ORCID number.	3. Given the ORCID.	
<ul> <li>4. Address the following subsections.</li> <li>Acknowledgments</li> <li>Funding</li> <li>Conflict of interest</li> <li>Ethical approval</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Given the Acknowledgements, Funding, Conflict of interest and Ethical approval subheading.</li> </ol>	