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Reviewer's report:

"PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)

No - there are minor issues

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are minor issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Maybe - with major revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: The authors have done an extensive revision based on the reviewer's comments. I have here carefully looked at both the responses to the earlier reviewer's comments and added my comments and suggestions in order to improve the quality of the manuscript further.

The study topic is important in the field of child health, but the manuscript still needs a lot of improvements before it can be considered further.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Major revision

Abstract:

The study aim says that this study assess resources available for the care of sick newborns, but it is not clear what kind of resources the authors are looking at?

The methods lack information on whom the questionnaire was sent, total sample size and the analytical strategy used to answer their research aim. It is not clear to me how the facilities, technologies and treatment quality are measured and whether these can be measured quantitatively.

In the results, is the author talking about medical equipment or other equipment should be made clearer?

Background:

In the second sentence, please also provide which country has the largest number of births if China is the second-largest and the reference.

The fourth sentence, "....neonatal mortality rate ....33.1% in 1991...." may be wrong, I suppose it is 33 deaths per 1000 live births and so on. Please check!

The background clearly lacks the rationale for e.g. what was the developmental status of medical resources in earlier years, in which aspect of medical resources the authors are interested in and what possible impact of these resources on overall neonatal survival?

The study aim sounds like a qualitative which is hard to answer quantitatively.
Methods:

It is not clear if the survey was conducted on the selected 150 hospitals out of how many hospitals, whether the hospitals are local, regional or primary or tertiary? What was the sampling strategy for selecting these hospitals? I can see that some details are provided in the results, but the methods also need some basic information on these.

Please clarify if the questionnaire was distributed to the parents of the neonates who were discharged from 150 hospitals through the members of CAN.

Authors should provide more details on what were information was collected through a questionnaire survey and how each of those measured?

In statistical analysis, the authors stated that they conducted univariate and bivariate analyses to describe the response obtained regarding the distribution of neonatal critical care facilities, physicians resources etc., but it is not known how each of them was defined/measured?

Results:

Results are mostly written well. The full form of the abbreviation used in the tables should be provided as under table note.

The technological developmental part (what defined development in technology) is not very clear to me in the results, although this has been a primary focus in the study aim.

Discussion:

Overall, the discussion is written well, but still, some critical inputs on the main findings in the context of known results from earlier research are needed. Currently, the discussion is simply the description of their results. For e.g. for doctor/bed, nurse/bed ratio, what is optimal if there is any standard?

Please provide the strengths of your study not only the limitations. I suggest that the strengths and limitations of the study should be provided before the conclusion.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

No

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.

No

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:
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