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Reviewer's report:

The revised analysis is improved and appropriate for the question. The revised validation approach is appropriate.

Major Compulsory Revisions

None

Minor Essential 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.

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.

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.

Discretionary Revisions

None

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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