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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? YES
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? THE METHODS ARE WELL DESCRIBED BUT THERE ARE INADEQUACIES, SUCH AS THE FAILURE TO ACCOUNT FOR CHILDHOOD EXPOSURE VARIABLES THAT MIGHT HAVE INFLUENCED THE OUTCOMES ASSESSED.
3. Are the data sound? THERE IS A LOW FOLLOW-UP AT FU2. THE DATA DO NOT MAKE BIOLOGICALLY SENSE, AS THERE IS AN INCREASED RISK OF ONE ALLERGIC DISEASE, [RHINOCONJUNCTIVITIS], NO RISK OF ANOTHER [ECZEMA] AND A REDUCED RISK OF ASTHMA. THIS SEEMS BIOLOGICALLY IMPLAUSIBLE
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? YES
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? YES
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? NO, SEE COMMENTS ABOVE IN 2 AND 3.
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? YES
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? YES
9. Is the writing acceptable? YES

Major Compulsory Revisions
- THE AUTHORS NEED TO DISCUSS THE MAJOR LIMITATIONS: FAILURE TO ADDRESS CHILDHOOD EXPOSURES THAT MIGHT INFLUENCE OUTCOMES BIOLOGICALLY IMPLAUSIBLE RESULTS: INCREASED RISK OF RHINITIS, AND REDUCED RISK OF ASTHMA

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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