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Reviewer's report:

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors. These physicians from the National University in Nablus provide the first information about the incidence of ROP in three nurses in the West Bank and Gaza. Among the infants examined the incidence of ROP was similar to that of other regions where an increasing number of premature infants are surviving. These are data from which effective ROP blindness prevention programs can be developed.

General comments:
I find the presentation a bit confusing and somewhat redundant, but the overall impact is that there is a need for such programs and they have begun. However, the real thrust of this work must be detecting ROP that requires treatment, a relatively small proportion of those infants who require examination. It would be helpful to have a review of the grammar for this journal, for example the use of "it's" in the third sentence of the first paragraph. The bolded sections in results and discussion are distracting

Specific comments:

Background:
Last sentence of para 3 - needs revision or proper references
Para 4 - needs to be revised, shortened and distinction made between countries with low and moderate levels of human development and those with high levels of human development (this seems a more useful contact that low, moderate and high income countries)

Methods:
Para 1 - combine the second and third sentences and shorten to just provide the criteria used to determine where ROP screening was indicated.
Para 3 - For purpose of data analysis - use "examined" rather than "explored"
Ethical considerations - I do not understand the sentence "no human being was addressed."

Results:
Para 1, line 2 - insert "retrospective" before "study"
Para 2 - move above Table 1
Para 3 - much of this is redundant to Table 2 and perhaps just highlighting major findings would be
more helpful
Para 3, sentence 3 - it does not seem reasonable to provide p values for the comparison of vaginal delivery vs C-section.
Para 3, sentence 6 - the method obtaining this p value is not clear
Para 5, line 1 - compared to what?

Discussion:
This needs tightening to put these results in context rather than a litany of findings and other studies.
Para 2 - very useful context and the major finding of the study
Para 3 - put "in grams" after birth weight
Para 5 - "Neonatal co-morbidities" - reformat for clarity
Para 7 - "Surfactant" - suggest change "insignificant"
Limitations, sentence 2 - provide how many NICUs there are in Palestine for context

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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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.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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