

Review of: "How to burp an infant – a prospective comparative pilot study on four different methods"

Manoel Antonio da Silva Ribeiro¹

¹ Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The study is a case report, not a prospective pilot.

The author should review concepts that cause confusion: Vomiting corresponds to the violent expulsion of gastric contents through the mouth, which may be preceded by nausea, paleness, tachycardia, tachypnea, sweating and sialorrhea. Regurgitation corresponds to the passive, effortless return of stomach contents to the mouth, which is not preceded by nausea. Regurgitation is a normal physiological situation, unlike vomiting.

With that, the 3rd paragraph of the introduction: seems out of context, as well as the first and last sentences of the 4th paragraph.

Nor can it be said that "Presented here is the first known study". Have you searched all databases in the world?

Methodology:

It should be noted that this is a case report and not a prospective pilot study. Several data were missing: the birth weight of the twins; birth weight z-score for gestational age; the age of the children who started the study, whether there was a possible history of gastroesophageal reflux.

How was the random distribution of the techniques studied carried out?

How was vomiting classified as none, minimal, moderate or large?

Was any test performed to verify the normality of the variables?

Were all the techniques done by the father alone?

Results

"from the infants' age of 5 months to almost 7 months": This is methodology and not results.

You must put the average and standard deviation of weight gain (or daily or weekly or monthly) for each of the twins.

The phrase "Attempts at burping were most successful in the sitting with rocking position, occurring in 79.9% of attempts but least successful in the shoulder position without back patting where 66.3% of attempts resulted in burping." it is already demonstrated in figure 1. Avoid repetition in the text of data presented in tables and figures.

Figure 1: Remove the title of the figure, because it is already shown in the caption; remove the “.0%” from the “Y” axis line and mark only the “%” as the title of that axis; I suggest dividing this axis into 20% or 25% intervals; remove the “%” symbol from the data in the columns that represent the variables.

The values presented for the variable “time to burping” should be expressed as mean and standard deviation.

Figure 2: Withdraw the title of the figure, because it is already shown in the caption. Median and range values were demonstrated, while average values were discussed. It's not suitable. Furthermore, this figure shows that there are no differences between the techniques, contrary to what was written in the text.

Figure 3: remove the “.0%” from the “Y” axis line and mark only the “%” as the title of that axis.