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**Reviewer's report:**

Discretionary Revisions

The authors have addressed the concerns I had communicated, and those of the other referees.

I have a suggestion re. use of the word "suction" with reference to delivery. Vacuum assisted delivery is the accepted term. I realize they used suction in their questionnaire, but actually, suction refers to suctioning the infant's mouth and airway, which is quite different. Many infants require some suctioning following delivery to clear secretions. It would be impossible for them to go back and determine which babies needed vacuum assisted delivery for this study. I would recommend leaving this variable out unless they are completely certain that parents understood their meaning. The authors refer to future prospective studies. I would suggest they seek advice from neonatology or obstetrical consultants re. phrasing of their questions, to be more accurate in collecting the data they wish to obtain.

My response regarding level of interest relates to the retrospective, convenience sample, and thus, the real limitations in generalizability. Should they wish to pursue a prospective study of this population, I believe there would be more interest and importance. Again, I would recommend very careful planning with regard to the question they are asking and the data they will need to collect, as is appropriate to scientific inquiry.
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