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Advice on publication: Other (see below)

Discretionary revisions:
. Page 8, 2nd paragraph, lines 4-9: Could you please explain the statistical procedures in more detail? It is not quite clear on the first glance, why a cosine-fitting function was applied
. Page 12, 1st paragraph, line 8: "optimal amounts of light; postpartum status" - "optimal amounts of light; however, postpartum status"

Compulsory revisions:
. Page 5, 2nd paragraph, line 1: "low levels of light exposure was not necessarily" - "low levels of light exposure were not necessarily"
. Page 7, 1st paragraph, line 7: "signed an IRB." - please spell out all abbreviations on first use
. For the presentation of the results: could you also present the results of the statistical tests with the corresponding test-value
. Page 9, 1st paragraph, line 8: "None specifically reported symptoms" - "None of the subjects specifically reported symptoms"
. Page 9, 3rd paragraph, line 3: "0.85": it is not quite clear, what is meant by that. From which mean log10[lux] can a value of 0.85 be distinguished?
. Page 11, 2nd paragraph, line 7: "without sacrificing her exposure to the environment of light that" - "without sacrificing her exposure to light that"
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