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Reviewer's report:

Overall, this is a much clearer and easy to read manuscript. Well done.

I still have a few minor issues that I believe are important to maintain the clarity of the information the authors are trying to deliver.

Line 142: the first use of the term "non-resident", please clarify this. Non-resident of china? Non-resident of the province? Non-resident of the city?

Line 186 - 190: "To prevent intrauterine infection regular dosing regimen of penicillin G is 3 million units intravenously every 8 hours whenever necessary. After rupture of membranes for 12 hours, oral erythromycin enteric capsules were administered to most patients. Combined use of antibiotics can also be seen."

The first sentence in this paragraph is a statement, and does not indicate that the patients in this study actually received this therapy. This is the results section of the manuscript. Is this statement directly related to a specific number of patients in the study? Either remove or add specific data.

The second sentence remains unclear. Did "most" patients only receive oral erythromycin for 12 hours, or do the authors mean that erythromycin was commenced 12 hours after rupture of membranes? Or do they mean that erythromycin was only commenced if the rupture of membranes was present for 12 hours prior to delivery?

Line 201 - 203: "Considering the poor outcomes, treatment was discontinued due to meningitis, intracranial haemorrhage, collodion baby, and prematurity with respiratory failure."

Suggest removing "due to", as this implies that the authors would never treat a patient with meningitis. Consider "treatment was discontinued in cases where the outcome was considered to be poor, which included a child with severe meningitis, intracranial haemorrhage…" or any sentence structure that better relays the authors intended point.

Line 219 - 222: "Since 2001, several studies have reported invasive neonatal GBS disease in 220 China(9-12), but there is a lack of systematic research (9-12). 118 infants with invasive GBS infection were found over a 4-year period from 7 hospitals (2011-2015) (12)."
Consider rephrasing as the sentences are disjointed.

Suggestion: Since 2001, several studies have reported invasive neonatal GBS disease in China, with one paper reporting 118 infant cases across 7 hospitals between 2011 to 2015 (9-12). However, there is a lack of systematic research (9-12).

Line 220: remove reference in middle of sentence

Line 260: include reference

Line 279: "GBS screened positive was not detected." This sentence does not make sense. Please rephrase.

Line 279 - 285: please make it clear at the beginning of this paragraph that these are the limitations of the study. Will make it easier to read and understand.

Line 275 - 277: "The prompt diagnostic evaluation leads to a lower fatality rate of EOD cases, and higher mortality of LOD cases may be due to delayed medical treatment."

While I agree that the first part of the sentence is true, if the authors have no reference for the statement then they need to rephrase, "prompt diagnostic evaluation will likely contribute to a lower…"
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