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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for allowing me to review the revised manuscript. THis is a very interesting project and highlights yet another of the often intangible benefits of DCC. The authors are to be commended for their efforts at revision and clarification. I had a couple of minor points.

- I am still a little concerned about including mothers of deceased infants. I worry that the mental anguish of infant mortality alters the scores of the surveys, falsing attributing an effect to delayed cord clamping. Perhaps the authors could do a limited analysis removing those infants to ensure that results are still similar?

- I appreciate the inclusion of the "additional file" with more complete data about the included infants/mother, but I would like to repeat my request for statistical comparison between the groups. I do not think that it is sufficient to rely on a randomization design to ensure that the groups are balanced. For example, the infants with delayed cord clamping appear to have been born by c-section much more often (63% of cases) compared to those without delayed cord clamping (54% of cases) but I am unable to judge if that was statistically significant. The current table format makes statistical analysis difficult, as there are already multiple columns based on survey completion. The authors should add an additional table to "additional file" listing a baseline statistic comparison.

- I really like the ROC curve, nice depiction of the results! The table underneath may not be necessary and could be removed for space-conserving reasons, if needed.
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