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Reviewer's report:

1. Abstract. I believe the authors should say "an important risk factor", rather than "most important risk factor" given other risks such as chorioamnionitis, PPROM, morbid obesity, etc. Its difficult to prove one is the single most important factor.

   There should be one primary outcome, not 7 as listed.

   Endometritis misspelled in Result sub-heading

   Can the authors list RR as well as p-values?

2. Background. Line 19-21 is oddly worded and recommend edits. Wound infections still occur if strict aseptic precautions are taken.

3. Materials and Methods. What dose of Cefazolin was used?

   Randomization misspelled

   Space between block and randomization

   Space between 1106 and could

   What was the exact timing of pre-incision administration? 30 mins?

   How were infections determined? What criteria?

   There is little detail on how cord blood was collected and analyzed?

   Statistics - What normality tests were used if any?

   Cefazolin misspelled

4. Results.
Demographics - several typos, spacing issues, strange capitalizations in this section. Please correct

The paragraph on birth weight can be shortened. Cefazolin should not affect.

Again recommend relative risks for the outcomes, with confidence intervals

Is the "2-3%" of the drug based on a mean cord blood level? It was fairly variable

5. Discussion. Lines 27-39 is confusing, it isn't clear the authors are talking about Owens paper until the very end. Last sentence should be first.

6. Conclusion

I don't believe the study is powered to detect neonatal sepsis differences, so it is hard to say with confidence the final sentence. It is reassuring that no difference was seen in this and other studies, but should soften that conclusion.

7. References : #6 - why are the authors not listed?

8. Tables : Would list p-values in Table 1

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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