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Title: Birth-weight, insulin levels, and HOMA-IR in newborns at term.

Reviewer’s report:
This manuscript is much improved but there are still some methodologic issues that should be clarified:

a. You have not used SGA/AGA/LGA classification, rather you have defined your children using cut-offs for low birthweight and high birweight. This means that your sample is not necessarily comparable to that of Wolff et al and this needs to be noted. If you actually used percentiles to define SGA you might have had a larger population in that group.

Response. We added a paragraph (2nd paragraph, lines 12-14) to recognize this limitation in the comparison between our results and those from Wolf et al.

b. When you discussed matching, do you mean you matched the mothers for phase 2 to the mothers in phase 1?

Response. The purpose of matching the groups in study was to control potential confounders related with maternal characteristics that could exert an effect on birth-weight of newborns. Because in the first phase of the study we included only appropriate-for-gestational age newborns, we estimate that the rationale for matching maternal characteristics apply only for the second phase of the study.

We rewrote the 1st paragraph on page 5 and 2nd phrase in Discussion section in order to clarify the statement; furthermore, we delete the sentence that compared the maternal characteristics of mothers enrolled in the 1st and 2nd phases of the study.

The data in the abstract are confusing- there is some missing punctuation.

Response. The manuscript was reviewed by a native-English speaker, improving grammar and spelling