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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Rachel Neilan,

Enclosed please find the 2. revised version of our manuscript entitled "Nutrition of preterm Infants who develop Bronchopulmonary Dysplasia". We changed the title in “Nutrition of preterm infants in relation to bronchopulmonary dysplasia” according the reviewer suggestion!

We do acknowledge the valuable suggestions, which help to further improve our manuscript. Several changes were made according to these suggestions and were partial integrated in this revised version. These changes are all listed below, in a point-by-point reply to each referee separately
Yours sincerely
(on behalf of the co-authors)

Dr. Andreas Wemhöner

Comments to the Reviewer

Title: Nutrition of preterm Infants who develop Bronchopulmonary Dysplasia

Version: 2 Date: 12. January 2011

Reviewer: Vineet Bhandari

Major compulsory revisions:

We are sorry for this mistake. According to the criticism of the reviewer corrections have been made in the manuscript (Page 8, line 11 and Table 1: number 69).

Minor revisions:

1. Background. Page 3, line 3. The typographical error was corrected as suggested by the reviewer.

2. Methods, page 4, line 29: The sentence was re-phrased as suggested by the reviewer.

3. Methods, page 5, line 5-6. The birthweight determining for the starting amount of enteral feeding was clarified by using the additional symbol for “equal to” as suggested by the reviewer.

4. Results, page7, line 9: The correction of the phrase “post-conceptual” to post-menstrual” was made according to the suggestion of the reviewer.

5. Results, page 7, line 26: We are sorry for the typographical error. The cut-off values are 43.5 g protein. The correction was made in the adequate section of the paper.

6. Table 1. page 12, line 4: According to the critics of the reviewer the correction was made.
Reviewer: Namasivayam Ambalavanan

Major compulsory revisions:

1. Multivariate logistic regression analyses were applied but showed no significant results. So, these would not improve the manuscript and we reject the sentence: “To identify independent predictors for reaching the minimal nutritional requirement, multivariate logistic regression analyses were applied.”!

Minor revisions:

1. Title: We agree with the reviewer and the title was changed accordingly.

2. Page 5: The typographical error was corrected.

3. Page 9: We kindly thank the reviewer for re-phrasing the two sentences. The correction was made according to the reviewer’s suggestion.