



# *Author's response to the editor/reviewers*

## **Guidelines:**

- Always change technical errors.
- Always correct reference errors.
- Always add additional references suggested by the reviewers.
- Always change sections unclear to the reviewer.
- Always change comments made by both reviewers.
- Always be polite.
- Always argue scientifically and systematically.

## **Process:**

- If the comments involve minor changes, discuss these with your mentor and get going in preparing the documents to submit.
- If the comments involve major changes, then discuss with your mentor and co-authors. Sometimes a strategy for answering comments or for doing additional analysis should be discussed and agreed upon by all authors.
- Prepare documents for re-submission.
- Circulate these documents to all the authors and ask for their comments within a short period of time.
- Resubmit the documents within the grace period granted by the editor.

## **You must prepare at least the following 3 documents:**

1. Letter to the editor.
2. Document with response to reviewers.
3. Manuscript with track changes. Check requirements from the journal.

Some detail about these documents:

### **1. Letter to the editor**

The letter should include the following:

- Thank the editor for reviewing the paper.
- Write a brief summary of the changes that you have made to the article (major changes).
- You can ask the editor's opinion regarding differences between reviewers (major differences).
- The letter should be brief (Half a page or less).

## 2. Document with response to reviewers.

- Reply to reviewer 1.
- Thank the reviewer and give a brief (1 paragraph) summary of the changes.

Now copy the comments the reviewer made and respond to these comments one by one.

Examples:

Comment 1.

This is an interesting article on the management neonatal hyperbilirubinemia in a low income country and would be a valuable addition to the literature.

*Response:*

*We thank the reviewer for this kind comment*

Comment 2:

It is unclear which neonates were included in each arm of the intervention.

*Response:*

*To ensure clarity of which neonates were included in the intervention arm and the control arm of the study we have now included a flow diagram (Figure 2) in the article. Reference to Figure 2 is included in the manuscript (page 2 line 15).*

Comment 3:

The scientific value of the article would be enhanced if the authors had long term data on the outcome of the neonates included in the observational arm of the intervention.

*Response:*

*We agree with the reviewer. Unfortunately the study was conducted in a region of the province where the long term follow up of these children was not possible due to logistical constraints. We have carefully considered this and are planning a long-term follow up study to try to address this important issue. We have included this as a weakness of the study in the discussion (p6 line 13).*

Comment 3,4,5,6 etc.

Reply to Reviewer 2,3,4

## 3. A manuscript with track changes and one without track changes (see journal requirements).