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Reviewer's report:

General

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

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

1. I am averse to the use of 3D charts, such as Figures 2 and 3. Any text on presentation of statistics will warn against there (e.g. The Visual Display of Quantitative Information, by Tufte, Common errors in statistics, by Goode, or Elements of Graph Design, by Kosslyn).
2. In the limitations section of the discussion, the authors should include a statement about the exploratory nature of the study, and the possibility of the results capitalizing on chance.

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

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. Page 7 “We than reduced”.
2. Page 8: “Late postnatal treatment with steroids posed”. I wouldn’t have said “posed” was the best word here.

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

1. I would rather see a Cohen’s kappa (if possible) than simply saying that the examiners were in agreement in 99% of cases. (However, this is only in the response to the reviewers).
2. The authors write “To assess the relative risk of post-natal steroids in multivariate models, we decided to further condense the information on any application versus no application.” I don’t understand this argument.
3. The authors might consider putting p-values in the tables.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

Statistical review: No
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