



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_41821
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimated burden of premature death and morbidity from low birth weight infants in Thailand
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	I would suggest a limitations paragraph, including your statements re not factoring in gestational age. Also, the discussion section seems to be a lot of short ideas, is there a way to combine into larger ideas, maybe use headings to highlight the points you are trying to make. Ethical Issue: None noted, no ethical approval was obtained	Thank you so much for invaluable comments. - Authors added the suggested point in the limitation paragraph with highlighted. - Authors modified the presentation style in the discussion part (combine into larger ideas) and the modified sentences are highlighted. - Regarding with the ethical issues, as our study analysis was based on secondary data, authors believed that this study will not require the ethical approval. Authors mentioned this explanation in the manuscript under the ethical consideration.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 44 "... become worsen" rewrite just worsen I would suggest spelling out DALYs the first time you use it in intro section Line 52 "its" maybe "the" would be better Some of the paragraphs under results with the large totals of years lost might be clearer with the word total. The second paragraph under data sources was hard to follow, I would rewrite for clarity. Not everyone is a familiar with the terms and data sources. Under results, you mention maternal age, it might be clearer in a table with all findings or just be clearer in your sentence grammar I assume it is your discussion section under the last table Line 238: Rewrite this sentence "The burden due to LBW was nearly doubled in male compared with female as the premature death due to LBW was dominant in male than female" It might be good to define what you mean by all perinatal conditions, birth complications? Line 304 needs rewrite for grammar. Your conclusion could be developed a little more, tell the reader what you hope to accomplish by providing this information or further directions to explore.	Thank you so much for thoughtful review comments. - Corrected the suggested grammar (Line 42 and 50) in the manuscript and highlighted the correction part. - Authors rewrote the second paragraph under data sources and the changes are highlighted. - Authors rewrote the sentence about proportion of LBW among livebirths by maternal age to be clearer. (Line 125). - Yes, the discussion start after the last table. - Authors rewrote the suggested sentences and all these correction are highlighted in manuscript. (Moved this sentence to Line 213) - All perinatal conditions was defined by ICD-10 coding system and added that information in manuscript. - Previous line 304 was rewrote and moved to Line 284 in this revised manuscript. - Authors added some information in conclusion part according to the reviewer comment.
Optional/General comments	An interesting study. With all the acronyms, it is important to be really clear with the grammar to follow the points being made.	Thank you so much for indicating the important point. Authors carefully checked the acronyms usage with correct grammar to present the information clearly.