

## Review report

**BSMMUJ-17.3 – 74726**

Salivary gland lactate dehydrogenase: A novel diagnostic test for anticipation of neurodevelopmental outcome in perinatal asphyxia in developing countries

Prasad R *et al.* ([roshanprasad2000@gmail.com](mailto:roshanprasad2000@gmail.com))

| REVIEW COMMENTS  | AUTHOR RESPONSE   |
|--|---|
|  | [Note: Please write the responses to each point here mentioning line number(s). You must change the manuscript as per your response.] |
| <b>A. Mechanical review</b>  |   |
| Date sent to author: <b>9-Jul-24</b>   | Date: <b>9-Jul-24</b>   |
| <b>a. In the BanglaJoL submission platform</b>   |   |
| 1. Provide affiliation of all authors and ORCID of at least corresponding author.  | Affiliation of all authors and ORCID of the corresponding author has been provided.   |
| 2. Provide a cover letter as per the journal's format. <sup>1</sup>  | A cover letter is submitted.  |
| 3. Provide keywords within the limit. <sup>2</sup>   | Keywords have been reduced to limit.  |
| <b>b. In the Manuscript</b>  |   |
| 4. Provide a single file manuscript in Microsoft Word.   | Manuscript is submitted in a single file in Microsoft Word.   |
| 5. Insert continuous line numbers in the manuscript.   | Continuous line has been inserted.  |
| <b>Title page (page 1)</b>   |   |
| 6. Provide title and short title in sentence case.   | Title and short title are provided in sentence case.  |
| 7. Provide ORCID (at least for the corresponding author).  | ORCID of the corresponding author has been provided.  |
| 8. Mention the word count for main text.   | The word count for the main text is mentioned.  |
| <b>Highlights page (page 2)</b>  |   |
| 9. Provide highlights in bullet points. <sup>3</sup>   | Highlights have been provided.  |
| <b>Main body (page 3 onwards)</b>  |   |
| 10. Reduce the word count. <sup>4</sup>  | Word count for main body is reduced.  |
| <b>Footnotes</b>   |   |
| 11. Provide acknowledgements, author contributions (as per journal's format), funding (with memo no.), conflict of interest, ethical approval (with memo no.), and data availability statement (as per journal's format) under a separate heading. | The footnotes have been provided as per the journal's format.   |
| <b>References</b>  |   |
| 12. Provide DOI (PMID if DOI is not available) for journal and URL for website.  | DOI has been provided for all the references.   |
| 13. Reduce the reference limit. <sup>5</sup>   | References has been reduced.  |

<sup>1</sup> [www.bsmmuj.org/assets/file/Cover\\_letter\\_template.docx](http://www.bsmmuj.org/assets/file/Cover_letter_template.docx)

<sup>2</sup> Maximum 5 for research article, 6 for review article, 4 for brief article, 3 for case report

<sup>3</sup> 3 to 5 for the research and brief article, 2 to 3 for the research letter, perspective, commentary, data, and letter to editor, 2 to 3 learning points for the case report, and 6 for review article.

<sup>4</sup> Maximum 3000 for the research article, 1500 for the brief article, 750 for the research letter and case report, 5000 for the review article, 600 for the perspective, commentary, editorial, and data, and 400 for the letter to editor.

<sup>5</sup> Maximum 40 for research article, 20 for brief article, 15 for, 10 for research letter, case report, commentary, and perspective.

## B. Technical review

### ROUND 1

|  |        |  |  |
|--|--------|--|--|
| Reviewer's name: <b>Md. Nazmul Hasan</b>   |        |  |  |
| ORCID: <b>0000-0002-5737-5124</b>  |        |  |  |
| Date assigned: <b>16-Jul-24</b>  |        |  |  |
| Date submitted: <b>14-Aug-24</b>   |        |  |  |
| Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s? <b>No</b>  |        |  |  |
| Do you wish to be disclosed to the author? <b>Yes</b>  |        |  |  |
| Comments sent to author (Date: <b>3-Sep-24</b> )   |        | Date: <b>3-Sep-24</b>  |  |
|  | Score  | <b>[Note: Please response if the score is below 6]</b>   |  |
| How would you rate the originality and depth of the manuscript?  | 8      | -  |  |
| Is the manuscript written in a scholarly manner?   | 8      | -  |  |
| Does the manuscript have the potential to make a valuable contribution to the world of knowledge?  | 8      | -  |  |
| How would you rate the originality and depth of the manuscript?  | 8      | -  |  |
| 1. Highlights should be more specific, precise, and short.   |        | We have revised the highlights to make them more specific and concise.   |  |
| 2. I think strong recommendations like "We should universally adapt this test for evaluation of perinatal asphyxia and HIE and administer it to all newborns" cannot be made from this write-up. |        | We have adjusted our recommendations to reflect a more cautious approach. The revised text now suggests considering the adoption of salivary LDH testing based on its benefits and accessibility, without making an absolute universal recommendation. |  |
| Reviewer's recommendation: <b>Revisions Required</b>   |        |  |  |
| Reviewer's name: <b>C</b>  |        |  |  |
| ORCID: -   |        |  |  |
| Date assigned: <b>30-Aug-24</b>  |        |  |  |
| Date submitted: <b>31-Aug-24</b>   |        |  |  |
| Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s? <b>No</b>  |        |  |  |
| Do you wish to be disclosed to the author? <b>No</b>   |        |  |  |
|  | Yes/No |  |  |
| 1. Is the title appropriate?   | Yes    | -  |  |
| 2. Does the abstract provide a complete and accurate description of the content of the article?  | NA     | -  |  |
| 3. Are the study objective(s) clearly stated and logical?  | Yes    | -  |  |
| 4. Is the rationale/justification for conducting the study clear?  | Yes    | -  |  |
| 5. Are the methods described in sufficient detail so that the study could be reproduced?   | Yes    | -  |  |
| 6. Is the study design robust and appropriate to the stated objective(s)?  | Yes    | -  |  |
| 7. Are statistics used appropriately and described fully?  | Yes    | -  |  |
| 8. Are the table(s) and figure(s) clear and appropriate to address the objective(s) or research question(s)?   | Yes    | -  |  |
| 9. Is the discussion section critical and comprehensive about the main message of the manuscript?  | Yes    | -  |  |
| 10. Are the conclusions drawn supported by the results/ data?  | Yes    | -  |  |

|  |     |   |
|--|-----|---|
| 11. Are the references appropriate in number and up to date?   | Yes | - |
| 12. Are statements of the manuscript supported by appropriate reference(s)?  | Yes | - |
| 13. Is the storytelling straightforward, clear (i.e., does not impede scientific meaning or cause confusion), and logical? | Yes | - |
| 14. Is the overall length of the article appropriate?  | Yes | - |
| 15. Is the standard of English acceptable for publication?   | Yes | - |
| Reviewer's recommendation: <b>Accept</b>   |     |   |

|   |                       |
|---|-----------------------|
| <b>C. Editorial decision</b>              | Date: <b>3-Sep-24</b> |
| Final editorial decision: <b>Accepted</b> |                       |