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1. Abstract. Why was death from sepsis chosen as an outcome? That is vanishingly rare. It is not clear to me what 2-3 % means in terms of cord blood?

2. Background there are some spacing issues in the last paragraph

3. Patients and Methods. There are some spacing and punctuation problem in this section as well.

4. Results. There are some spacing and punctuation problem in this section as well. I am not sure if these are only in my copy. They are numerous

How was consent obtained if most patients had emergency c-sections? When did they consent? On admission?

Did all the patients have blood cultures?

5. Discussion.

No comments

6. References - No comments
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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