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Reviewer’s report:

Secondary data, such as the described NeoBase, may be a valuable and cost effective alternative for epidemiologic research. However, it has its limitations, most importantly the quality of the information that is registered. This is the first study to evaluate the quality of respiratory variables in a neonatal database. The question posed by the authors is well defined. The methods are appropriate and well described. The authors address major limitations of their study: 1. This study had a very small population; 2. While they found concordance was unrelated to GA and hospital, variations due to workload in the NICU (high versus low census) were not assessed and may significantly impact the quality of the data.

Discretionary Revisions:
There are small grammatical errors throughout the paper that should be addressed.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests