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Dear editor:

Our manuscript entitled “Influence of different preoperative fasting times on women and neonates in cesarean section: a retrospective analysis” has been carefully revised according to the Editor Comments. The manuscript has been professionally edited for English language readability prior to resubmission to the journal. We have taken the comments into account and wish to respond as follows:

Editor Comments: 1

Reviewer 2 has pointed out that mean +/- SD is not appropriate for describing Apgar score. While mean +/- SD can be used for non-normal distributions, you must make clear that the
distribution is non-normal when mentioning the SD, and it would be better to present the data as a median, together with inter-quartile ranges to indicate the location, spread, and skewedness of the data presented. Further, the student’s T-test is a statistical test suitable for normally distributed data. If the data is not normally distributed (as it is not for the Apgar score), then you cannot use this test to analyse these data, and you should use non-parametric tests instead. In addition, because the Apgar score values are a score, and not actual numerical values, the whole statistical analysis of this test becomes even more complicated. I recommend that you seek advice from a statistician at your institute to discuss how you can best present/analyse this data.

Answer: Thanks to the editor for giving us an opportunity to modify our manuscript again. This question was discussed by all the members of our research group. We decided to adopt the opinions of reviewer and editor. We divided the score of Apgar score into three partition segments: 0-5, 5-7 and 7-10. We calculate the number and percentage of each section for a descriptive statistic. These changes are shown in new Table 4, figure 3A and on page 8, lines 15-16, page 7, lines 4-5 of the manuscript, highlighted in blue.

Editor Comments: 2

Please state in the Ethics approval and consent to participate statement in the Declarations that consent to participate does not apply since this study used retrospective analysis of standard medical records and indicate how permission was obtained to access the records.

Answer: We have done it, which is shown in Declarations section on page 13, lines 1-2, highlighted in blue.

(In the end)

Thank you very much for your great efforts on our manuscript. We would like to express our great appreciation again to the reviewers and the editing staff at BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth for the manuscript comments.

We look forward to hearing from you, and, as before, please address all communications regarding this manuscript to me as the corresponding author.

Thank you very much for your attention to our paper.
Sincerely yours,

Jie Jia,

Department of Anesthesiology, Guangdong Women and Children Hospital, Guangzhou, China, No.13 Guangyuan West Road, Guangzhou, 510010, China.

Tel: +86 20 86501403; E-mail: jiajie66research@sina.com