

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_88091
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTIVENESS OF ORAL PROBIOTICS IN PREVENTION OF NECROTIZING ENTEROCOLITIS IN PRETERM INFANTS
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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	It is a work of great scientific interest but requires an extensive revision to obtain the maximum benefit. 1-Requires an extensive review of the quality of English 2-It is poorly organized, part of the review on the statistical data of probiotics in the literature is in the discussion 3-A revision of how the patients were chosen is lacking in the material and method, for example, patients > 36 weeks do not appear but those at term are not excluded. Low birth weight is excluded, which is not possible since almost all patients have this condition. It says that those with mechanical ventilation were excluded, but 28-week-gestational age patients appear in the results, and it seems doubtful that they did not receive mechanical ventilation. Also, if it is a controlled randomized study, how was this process done and when was this process done (postnatal days). Was the intention-to-treat method used? Was an inform consent signed? 4-It reads in material and method "Efficacy in both groups was measured after following the patient till 7 days in terms of in terms of no incidence of NEC after 48 hours". They were only given probiotics for 7 days? what about the NEC of the second and third week? 5-What criteria was used to diagnose NEC? 6-The results are very incomplete and imprecise. Mean age of patient refers to age at admission, discharge, treated or what? Same as mean weight. 7-In the discussion, in addition to containing a large amount of text that should have been in the introduction, there are phrases such as "In premature newborns, necrotizing enterocolitis (NEC) is among the most surprising and deadly infections." which are false and contradict the multifactorial origin of NEC. 8-The conclusions are very poor.	All the necessary corrections were done as indicated
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	I recommend English and statistics consultancy	Noted

**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)  Yes. There is no data on inform consent to enter this trial or any ethical issues discussed.	