

Reply to the Editor.

Dear Respected Editor/Reviewer

Good day

Thank you very much for the comprehensive review and for your precious time that you spent in reviewing this study. We did the advised changes and answered the queries. All the changes were marked by red colour for easily tracking by the reviewer. The manuscript looks much better with these changes, and we tried to improve the language as we can. Thank you gain for your precious assistance.

Here we are replying point by point:

The reviewer Comments:

Reviewer #1:

Thank you very much for your precious time you spent in reviewing the article and for your positive feedback.

Reviewer #2:

Thank you very much for your precious time you spent in reviewing the article and for your positive feedback. We considered your precious comments seriously and did the needed corrections, highlighted in red.

Specific Comments to Authors:

The review is well-written and well comprehensive. Actually, it is clear that the Authors do not suggest relying on b-lines for any diagnostic purpose: "Evidence of compact coalesced B-lines in the lung denotes a severe form of the alveolar-interstitial syndrome, known as "white lung". It is normal to visualize B-lines in healthy neonatal lungs. Their number will decrease with the baby's growth until being non visualized at the age of 6 months in a healthy infant" It should be clearly stated that the use of this approach, even sparsely suggested, is potentially harmful, because does not provide definite diagnostic information and allow bad-reposed trust in the procedure.

Our reply: We make the point raised by the respected reviewer clearer and added in the manuscript itself and the limitation section. The corrections are highlighted in red.

Legal implications are many, and, above all, the risk that true expertise in lung ultrasound imaging is not appropriately addressed and asked. In other words: lung ultrasound imaging is very useful, when definite imaging is possible also in newborn. The misuse of artifacts as a diagnostic tool is to be abandoned.

Our reply: We make the point raised by the respected reviewer clearer and added in the manuscript itself and the limitation section. The corrections are highlighted in red.

Reply to the Editors:

Thank you very much for your rigorous support.

We confirm that the figures are original.