

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_82100
Title of the Manuscript:	Fluid Management Using Cardiometry in ARDS Patients
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:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The article is correctly written and is an extremely interesting topic. A pilot study is a research study that takes place before the actual study. Pilot studies are typically run following the same steps as the actual study, but on a smaller scale. Its objective is to detect possible failures or problems in the study. In this case, the study design does not seem appropriate to assess the efficacy and safety of an intervention. Within design issues, a sample size calculation would initially be appropriate, on the other hand, a control group and ideally a randomization method would be essential. In this case, an interventional, uncontrolled study is proposed, which is subject to a risk of bias that does not allow estimating a differential effect in patients treated with this method. I propose to redefine the study as a randomized, controlled clinical trial, perhaps without blinding of interventions could be tolerated for harsh outcomes	Done
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	It would be appropriate to expand and reference this comment in the discussion "The EC shows accuracy and precision in studies of healthy volunteers" and define its role as a diagnostic method in other studies to assist or guide treatment.	Done
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Redefine the study as a randomized, controlled clinical trial, perhaps without blinding of interventions could be tolerated for harsh outcomes.	Done

### PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	