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Reviewer's report:

A nationwide survey on neonatal medical resources in mainland China: current status and future challenges

Dear Editor and authors

We reviewed the Manuscript Number: BPED-D-18-00711R1:


The authors concluded that, Neonatal Department development in mainland China is not balanced and still faces many problems, such as staff shortage, inadequate facilities, and imperfect transport. It is urgent to set up a NICU classification system to improve the prognosis of critically ill.

General:

This paper gives a nice overview of the status of neonatal departments in mainland China on staff, facilities, technologies, transport systems and treatment quality.

However overall this paper is incomplete and important details of concepts are missing through the whole paper. This makes it for the reader difficult to understand and interpret results & outcome. It is hard to understand and interpret the manuscript when levels of ND are not clear. When are the results related to an intensive care, and of which level, and when are the results coming from general neonatal wards? Differentiation is not made and outcomes are presented in an overall general way. This raises the question what this study add for others than China.

Specific:

Abstract.
What is extreme premature? Which gestational age. Missing the levels of the different ND's included in the survey.

Same as in the abstract is in the introduction. Concepts need to be clarified and referred to recent literature and guidelines. In addition the introduction needs more depth of the problem written in a funnel. Start with general information and narrow to the problem and aim of the study.

The method section is limited. The survey was performed in 2012 which is 7 years ago and I assume and hope that things are changed. Also the questionnaire is not described or referred to. What questions were asked in detail is what helps the reader to understand.

Results

To understand the results one should know the levels of the different wards included and what kind of neonatal wards they were? Surgical, cardiology or what? In the discussion this is mentioned but this is far too late.

Discussion

The discussion clarifies some questions mentioned above. This should not be the case and should have written in introduction, method and result sections. A lot of repetition is written in this part of the paper.

The limitations under the heading conclusion should be in the discussion section.

Overall

Clarify main concepts in introduction

Be consistent in writing and specific

Refer in a proper way

Use comma's when necessary

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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