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1. Abstract. I don't agree that the quantity of the antibiotic was found to be inconsequential to the newborn. The 2-3 % is low, but this study is not powered for neonatal sepsis.

2. Background Line 22-24 This sentence is oddly worded and more conversational than scientific. Recommend deletion or revision.

3. Patients and Methods. Page 7, Line 3-4, it says the reason for loss to follow up is listed below, but then it isn't explained until page 9.

4. Results. What did the other 3 neonates die from?

You can’t really have a mean Apgar of 8.5, as this isn't a viable score. Usually for these types of categorical variables, rank-sum tests or other non-parametric testing is most appropriate.

Again, I would eliminate outcomes that had no cases in the study, ie NEC or sepsis. It just wastes space and we can’t comment on it.

Cefazolin misspelled on page 12

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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