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Reviewer's report:

Title: Incidence and risk factors of Retinopathy of Prematurity in three neonatal intensive care units in Palestine

Purpose:
To investigate the incidence of retinopathy of prematurity and its association with some risk factors in Palestine.

Summary: This was a retrospective study of 115 infants screened over 1 year for ROP in 3 NICUs. The authors report the incidence of ROP in their cohort and uni- and multi-variate analysis of risk factors associated with the development of ROP.

FYI:
Cover page, summary page abstract does not match up with the manuscript abstract

Abstract:
-(line 4): Change "affects" to "affect"
-(line 11): please add the incidence of type 1 ROP during this time period
-(line 20): Please clarify which other parts of the world it is comparable to or just rewrite to be more consistent with discussion and conclusion sections - as in the discussion, the authors write, "It is considered a relatively low percentage compared to neighboring countries that have different levels of human development index" and in the conclusion they write, "The incidence of ROP is considered a relatively low percentage compared to neighboring countries that have higher levels of human development"

Background:
-(line 9): would change "were performed" to "have been performed"
-(line 16): would change "no such data" to "no such published data"

Methods:
-(page 3, lines 23-24 and page 4, line 1) - would change "similar to United States guidelines in 2006" to "based on United States guidelines in 2006" .. FYI: The United States guidelines in 2006 includes 30 weeks AND less, NOT 32 weeks and less (there was an error in the original published guidelines and the correction was published later)
-(page 4, line 5): change "time" to "timing"
-(page 5, line 2): add "neonatal characteristic" after "demographic"
-(page 5, line 8): I believe the authors looked at lowest hemoglobin and max bilirubin level "before first exam" - if this is correct, add this clarification
-(page 5, line 13): change "make" to "make up"

Results:
-general comment; when reporting p values and results, keep significant figures consistent throughout the manuscript (i.e. p=0.362 should be 0.36, since you used p=0.070 and for max bilirubin in text and table 3, add a significant figure (i.e. 5 = ?5.0 or something else?)
-(page 6, lines 6-7): change "involved" to "included"
-(page 6, lines 13-14): would remove this sentence because it's already in table 1 and repetitive
-(Page 7, line 4): the average BW among those that developed ROP in the text is listed as 1158, but in the table as 1185 - the authors need to be consistent and go back and check their numbers for consistency and accuracy.
-(Page 10, lines 2-6): delete these sentences

Discussion:
-(page 11, line 1): please add the incidence of type 1 ROP

Table 6:
-after Palestine include "(this study)"
-(page 12, lines 1-4): The United States guidelines in 2006 includes 30 weeks AND less, NOT 32 weeks and less (there was an error in the original published guidelines and the correction was published later), please correct this
-(page 12, lines 9-13): did any of these infants that did not meet US guidelines for ROP screening develop type 1 ROP? - would add this to the discussion
-(page 13, lines 5-7): would suggest changing this sentence to "However, being a part of multiple gestations and having a sibling -from the same gestation- affected by ROP is associated with increased risk for development of ROP in univariate, but not in the multivariate analysis."
-(page 13, lines 7-12): would remove these as not significant in the multivariate analysis.
-(page 13, lines 17-20): would remove these as not significant in the multivariate analysis.
-(page 13, line 21): would suggest changing this sentence to "The study found on univariate analysis that blood transfusion …"
-(page 14, lines 17-18): would suggest changing the end of the sentence to "…all were found as significant risk factors for ROP on univariate analysis in our study."
-(page 14, line 20-page 15, line 3): the authors state their results are "in agreement with many other studies", but the other studies they report contradict what this study shows … that "duration … carries no significance" and one study showed mechanical ventilation was of statistical significance while it was not in their study … so would change "This is in agreement with many other studies" to "our results had conflicting results compared to previously published studies" or something to that effect.

Conclusion
-overall, much improved - great work!
-(last sentence): would change "another study" to "more comprehensive studies are needed…" or "future studies are needed …"
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