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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor,

I would like to thank you and the reviewers for the careful re-reviewing of our revised article. We will take your advice on highlighting the changes made in the manuscript into consideration and we do apologize for the inconvenience this has caused and extra time the reviewer may have spent re-reading the article. Please find below the reply to the reviewer’s comments. We hope that you will find the amended version of our article suitable for publication in your journal.

**Point-by-point reply**

**Minor essential revisions**

1) The authors should check their reference list and their references in their Endnote file as most recent references are lacking years of publication: ref. 1 – Prescott SL (year of publication (2010) is missing; ref. 8 - Bonzini et al (year of publication (2010) is missing); ref. 9 – Shah PS (year of publication (2011) is missing,. ref. 10 – Zhao Q et al (year of publication (2011) is missing); ref. 13 - Clark et al (year of publication (2010) is missing), ref. 22, ref. 29, ref. 43 etc.

**Answer:** Indeed, year of publication of some recent articles (2010 and 2011) was missing in the Endnote file. This has been corrected.

2) Methods, page 6, line 19: “…since blood samples were analyzed the day of delivery”. Did the authors mean ‘on the day of delivery’?

**Answer:** Yes, thank you. This has been corrected.

3) Results, page 11, line 5: I suggest this amendment: “…the subset of 56 women with BETX personal exposure assessments and their newborns and the full cohort (n = 2002) from which our study sample was selected.

**Answer:** Thank you; this has been corrected.

4) Methods: Statistical analysis: p. 9, line 10. It is stated that for continuous variables means and standard errors were calculated, while in Tables 1-3 means and standard deviations are given.

**Answer:** Indeed, it is the standard deviations that were calculated and not the standard errors. This has been corrected in the manuscript.

5) P. 27, Note to Figure 2: I suggest replacing ‘prematurity’ by ‘preterm birth’ if that is what the authors mean according to the given definition on page 11.

**Answer:** Yes indeed. This has been corrected.

In addition: a clarification how seasons were defined, e.g. in Table.

**Answer:** We used the four calendar-based seasons (Northern hemisphere):