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Reviewer's report:

General
This is a large epidemiological study, including an impressive cohort of over 130,000 deliveries in Denmark. The study is interesting and well written. Obviously, it has several important limitations, and the authors have discussed most of them in the discussion section. I have several comments to the authors.

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

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

-------
1. Abstract: please add what other perinatal risk factors were adjusted for.
2. Methods: This reviewer is not familiar with “manual” delivery. I assume the authors mean vacuum delivery, and it should be corrected.
3. Results: Table 1 is not clear, and poorly presented. Authors state that several factors were more likely to be associated with low 5-minute Apgar scores. Yet, they do not present any comparison and statistical tests. Please add this important comparison and the relevant P-values to the Table.
4. Results, page 6: What is “protracted gestation?” As an obstetrician I am again not familiar with this term. Please define in the Methods section.
5. Discussion: Of major concern is the fact that defiantly not all children diagnosed with epilepsy become hospitalized. While the authors clearly discussed other limitations (such as false positive diagnosis and lack of crucial clinical details), they did not discuss this issue, as is appropriate. Please add another paragraph with this important limitation. Also, they examined only 32 outpatient cases. Can the authors examine more outpatient records?
6. Discussion: again, please revise “manual turning” to vacuum extraction (?).
7. Conclusions: I would delete or transfer the “other clinical measurements” since it is not a conclusion of the present article.

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

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

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

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

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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