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Dear Editor,

Thank you for statistical review of the manuscript. The article was read by a native English speaker and corrected for errors in English usage. We have also revised the manuscript as suggested by the reviewer about the minor essential revisions. The replies for the concerns rose by the reviewer as detailed below.

Minor essentials Revisions

1. Page 8: It would be helpful if the authors could provide justification for choosing their criterion (sens+spec)/2 as “optimum”. This is a reasonable criterion, but one of many.

   The choice was done to allow comparison with previous studies in this area, as we now specify in the text. We agree that is just one possible option as we discussed also with the reviewers.

2. Page 8: It should state that testing was done with a significance level of 0.05 and all tests are two-sided. The sentence “A two-tailed p-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant” is not correct.

   We changed the text as suggested by the reviewer.

3. Page 9: The sentence “The best predictor of LBW…” is unclear. In what sense does AUC provide a “best predictor”? In my view, the AUC gives a measure of the discrimination between groups and doesn’t identify the “best” predictor. See Harrell (2001) for details.

   We now write “had the best discrimination” in place of “was the best predictor”.

We look forward for a favorable outcome about publication in BMC Paediatrics.

On behalf of all the authors

Chandrashekhar T Sreeramareddy