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Dear Editor:

Please find attached our re-revised manuscript. We especially appreciate the suggestions made by Dr Beardsall and have answered their questions below and changed the manuscript where appropriate (changes are marked in red).

We hope this manuscript is now acceptable for publication in BMC Pediatrics.

Sincerely,

Frans J. Walther

Responses to reviewers:

Reviewer: Anne van Kempen
Reviewer's report: I am satisfied with the answers of the authors and changes in the manuscript.

Answers: Thank you.

Reviewer: Fabrizio BARBETTI
Reviewer's report: I am satisfied with Author's answers and changes/additions to the paper.

Answer: Thank you.

Discretionary revisions.
I would only suggest adding any measure of ketonuria -if available- made in infants with the highest (>15 mM) and sustained (>48 h) hyperglycemia. I would also suggest to disclose if they have implemented any standardized protocol to manage this condition as a consequence of this retrospective analysis.

Answer: We did not check for ketonuria in these infants. We are discussing whether to change our current protocol and not give insulin routinely for hyperglycemia except for extremely high glucose values (>20 mmol/l?).

Reviewer: Kathryn Beardsall
Reviewer's report: Most of the comments have been adequately addressed however I still have a couple of concerns
1. The difference in number of infants in the follow up study described in the tables 1 and 2 are now contradictory. If the baseline data are not available as stated by the authors n=84 in table 2, then how can there be n=96 in the baseline characteristics in table 1? Presumably it was n=84 included in the multivariate regression analyses
Answer: The reviewer is correct. The right number of patients in table 2 should be 33 exposed and 63 unexposed infants. Table 2 was corrected and the recalculation showed that both neurological and behavioral outcome were worse in the exposed group. We corrected the text where necessary.

2. Table 4 – If multiple variables were included and adjusted for then this information should be included in the model – if this was stepwise analyses and the variables were excluded from the model as not being significant then the model has not been adjusted for those variables those variables have been excluded from the model – this is not the same thing and needs to be described correctly.

Answer: The stepwise analysis was done using the variables reported in the methods section.

In addition
I apologies for not noting the comments in the results section. However it would be helpful to have this detail included in the section under statistical methods which would benefit from clarification as above. P values are normally given to one figure

Answer: Indeed, this was corrected.