

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Paediatrics Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Efficacy of anti-epileptic drugs in neonatal seizures: A systematic review protocol
AUTHORS	He, yang; tang, jun; zhang, meng; Xiong, Tao; Ojha, Shalini; Choonara, Imti; Mu, Dezhi

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Reviewer name: Raffaele Falsaperla Institution and Country: Unit of Neonatology, University Hospital "Policlinico - Vittorio Emanuele", Catania, Italy. Competing interests: Neonatology, Neurology, Paediatrics
REVIEW RETURNED	22-Mar-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	I believe that the manuscript has important problems The drafting, written in adequate English, is insufficient. It was necessary to describe in full how to carry out a systematic review on the selected topic. And a job that illustrates how a systematic review is performed is not innovative. Regarding the topic chosen, it would have made sense to develop it and therefore also draft the discussion and conclusions of the case.
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Reviewer name: Wenbin Dong Institution and Country: Department of Newborn Medicine, The Affiliated Hospital of Southwest Medical University, Luzhou, Sichuan, People's Republic of China Competing interests: Non competitive interests
REVIEW RETURNED	26-Mar-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	This paper compared the different AEDs in neonatal seizures and provided scientific basis for clinical AEDs selection. This paper is of high interest to the scientific community. I have no further comments.
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1 Professor Raffaele Falsaperla :

Question 1: Dear Author, I believe that the manuscript has important problems. The drafting, written in adequate English, is insufficient. It was necessary to describe in full how to carry out a systematic review on the selected topic. And a job that illustrates how a systematic review is performed is not innovative. Regarding the topic chosen, it would have made sense to develop it and therefore also draft the discussion and conclusions of the case.

Response: Thank you very much for the advice. We changed the protocol according to your instructions.

First, we added 'cerebral palsy' as the long-term neurodevelopmental outcome.

Second, we added more details including data extractions, as well as the conclusion of these case.

Reviewer 2 Professor Wenbin Dong :

Comments: This paper compared the different AEDs in neonatal seizures and provided scientific basis for clinical AEDs selection. This paper is of high interest to the scientific community. I have no further comments.

Response: Thanks for your review.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Reviewer name: wenbin DONG Institution and Country: the Affiliated Hospital of Southwest Medical University, Sichuan, China Competing interests: NO
REVIEW RETURNED	30-Apr-2020
GENERAL COMMENTS	no