

**Efficacy of expressed breast milk alone or in combination with paracetamol in reducing pain during retinopathy of prematurity screening: A randomized controlled trial.**

Chowdhury RM et al. ([rumpamonichowdhury@gmail.com](mailto:rumpamonichowdhury@gmail.com))

Reviewer's information			
Date review assigned	19-Feb-23	Date review returned	09-Mar-23
Reviewer name	A	Affiliation	-
Email	-	ORCID	-
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s?	None	Do you wish to be disclosed to the author?	No

Reviewer's comments (13-Mar-23)		Author's response (21-Mar-23)	
Please write Yes or No		Please write a response if the reviewer's comment is No. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.	
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?	Yes	-	
4. Are the Methods described sufficiently to allow others to repeat it?	Yes	-	
5. Are the operational definitions and ascertainment of key variables given adequately?	Yes	-	
6. Are the outcomes clearly defined?	Yes	-	
7. Are statistics used appropriately and described fully?	Yes	-	
8. Do the Results address the research question or objective clearly?	Yes	-	
9. Are the tables and figures clear and appropriate to address the objective or research question?	Yes	-	
10. Does the Discussion cover the main points of the paper?	Yes	-	
11. Are the strengths and limitations addressed?	Yes	-	
12. Are the conclusions justified by the results?	Yes	-	
13. Are the references up-to-date, and appropriate?	Yes	-	
14. Is the standard of written English acceptable for publication?	Yes	-	
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.	
<b>Minor comments</b>			
1. In the author's name: page 1, lines 5-29, please use superscripts 1,2, 3, 4 to mention the place of work/Institutions name.		1. Given as per journal's guidelines.	
2. In page 3, line 78 and 79, please delete (Craig 1994) and (Lawrence 1993).		2. Deleted as advised.	
3. Page 3, line 93, can use 'screening' instead of 'examination'.		3. Revised as advised.	
4. Page 6, lines 164-166, 'p< or =' is not mentioned.		4. Mentioned the <i>P</i> value.	

5. On Page 7, lines 184, 197, and 198 'discovered' word may be replaced with 'observed' in line 184 and 'mentioned' in 197, and 'mentioned or observed in their study'.	5. Corrected as advised.						
6. In line 189 references 18,19, 20 would come after the sentence, not before.	6. Formatted.						
7. Line 193, needs a reference after the sentence for Rosali et al.	7. Given the references.						
8. There are many grammatical mistakes and incomplete sentences. Kindly do a meticulous check.	8. We have thoroughly revised the English and grammatical mistakes and completed the sentences as appropriate.						
<b>Reviewer's Recommendation</b> (Tick mark on the open boxes to the right)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>a. Minor revision</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>b. Major revision</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>c. Reject</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	a. Minor revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	b. Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/>	c. Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Minor revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
b. Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/>						
c. Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>						

<b>Editor's comments (13-Mar-23)</b>	<b>Author's response (21-Mar-23)</b> 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. Your manuscript needs a MAJOR revision. This manuscript has one figure and two tables. The story around these findings could be easily written using a shorter length. Therefore, I suggest revising the manuscript using the criteria for a brief article, as per the guidance given in the attached Admin checklist.	Thank you so much for the response. We are agree to revise the manuscript as "Brief Article" and revised as per journal's guidelines.																				
2. Please mention the trial registration number in the Methods section	We have given the trial registration number in Methods. The number is: Clinical trial.gov NCT05354479 (Page 5).																				
3. Abstract should be formatted under Background, Methods, Results, and Conclusion subheadings.	Revised the abstract as advised in structured format (Page 2).																				
4. The whole Methods section is given in a single paragraph. This is difficult to read and understand. Kindly split these texts into a few paragraphs based on the topics.	Revised the methods section and given in a separate paragraph (Pages 4 and 5).																				
5. Flowchart needs refinement, especially for the arrows. Kindly use thinner lines of equal thickness. Indicate the exclusions using dotted curved arrows.	Formatted the flowchart as advised (Page 15).																				
6. Statistical analysis: While the statement regarding the comparison of quantitative variables using ANOVA is correctly given in line 138, the results given in the footnote of Table 2 (although the authors label these as Table 3) are not correct. Each group (A, B, C) was compared for 3 dependent variables: PIPP1-3. There should be one P value obtained by ANOVA at the bottom of each group. If the authors are interested to identify which PIPPs are different, a posthoc test such as the Tukey test could be done. The application of several t-tests for these is not correct. A sample table is given below:	We have re-analysed and revised the table 2. Also reflected in statistical analysis part under Methods section as below: "Data were analyzed with the Chi-square test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The mean difference between before and during and, before and after were further analyzed between and within the groups. Comparison between groups were done by post hoc test. The difference was considered significant for $P < 0.05$ ."																				
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>PIPP score</th> <th>Group A</th> <th>Group B</th> <th>Group C</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>5.0 (0.8)</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>16.4 (1.1)</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>10.3 (1.0)</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>P</td> <td>xxx</td> <td>yyy</td> <td>zz</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	PIPP score	Group A	Group B	Group C	1	5.0 (0.8)			2	16.4 (1.1)			3	10.3 (1.0)			P	xxx	yyy	zz	
PIPP score	Group A	Group B	Group C																		
1	5.0 (0.8)																				
2	16.4 (1.1)																				
3	10.3 (1.0)																				
P	xxx	yyy	zz																		
<b>Editor's Decision</b>	Major revision																				