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Reviewer's report:

General
This is a well written, extremely well conducted study with details about the study that demonstrate that great care was taken to remove any bias. However, given the recent publication by Ballantyne et al, the authors should make more of a case about why they think their's adds something.

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

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

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

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)
Since they did not get significant differences on the PIPP and since the facial action component of the PIPP tends to be more sensitive, it could be interesting if the facial actions were analyzed separately from the PIPP.
p16, the PIPP is weighted for younger babies and this is not clear in the first paragraph when they looked at the younger babies separately. Again, describe what this study adds that Ballantyne's did not.

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

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes