



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).