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Reviewer's report:

General

The authors have submitted a thoughtfully revised manuscript that addresses most of the comments from the reviewers. I have a few specific remaining comments.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

None.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. Statistics. The authors comment that Bonferroni corrected repeated t tests yield the same conclusion as the repeated measures ANOVA. This strengthens their contention that the differences they observe truly reflect population differences. It would be worthwhile for the authors to mention this in their Results or Discussion.

2. Number of samples in Figures 4 and 5. I disagree that the numbers of samples examined are not germane. Presumably, the total number of samples for each comparison is 50. It would matter to the reader, however, if one of the bars in a graph that showed "no difference" represented only 5 subjects, as the reader might infer that the chance of Type II error was high. The reader could calculate the number of samples represented in each bar by gleaning the information from Tables 1 and 2, but it would be better for the authors to provide the numbers in the Figure legends or in the Figures themselves.

3. Formatting/spelling errors.

   a. Page 9 1st para, line 15. Should be: "According to manufacturer's specifications,..."

   b. Page 12, last line. There is a hanging "(vs.)." The results are missing.

   c. Figure 3. On my copy of this, the bar colors did not appear in the legend.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

1. Reviewer 1 comments: The authors may wish to include their response to comment #5 (relationship to gestational age) in the text of the manuscript. It strengthens the manuscript.
2. Reviewer 2 comments: The authors may wish to include their explanation regarding storage sites of PDGF-BB in the text of the manuscript. It strengthens the manuscript.

3. Timing of peak PDGF-BB levels in infants not requiring O2 at 28 days. The authors state on pg. 12 that peak PDGF-BB levels in these infants were seen at 2.9 days. Figure 2 appears to show a peak at 4-5 days. The authors may wish to clarify this apparent discrepancy (which is, I think, the product of differing definitions).

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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