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Dear Madame,
Dear Sir,

Please find enclosed the revised manuscript entitled “Nutrition practice, compliance to guidelines and postnatal growth in moderately premature babies: the NUTRIQUAL French survey” by Silvia Iacobelli et al.

We really thank you very much for your interest in considering our manuscript for publication in BMC Pediatrics. We greatly appreciated the reviewers' advice and suggestions, which we have addressed and included in the revised version. We also made the required changes to the format of our paper, according to the author’s guidelines of the journal.

You will find at the bottom of this letter a point-by point list of the changes made, with our replay to all queries raised by the reviewers.

The authors state that there are no prior publications or submissions with any overlapping information, including studies and patients with regard to the present article.

By submitting the manuscript, the authors understand that the material presented in this paper is being submitted only to BMC Pediatrics, it will not be submitted elsewhere while under consideration and it has not been published before.

The authors understand that should the submitted material be accepted for publication in BMC Pediatrics, they will automatically transfer the copyright to the publisher, even for similar forms or verbatim.
I wrote the first draft of the manuscript and this work has been approved by all co-authors, who are responsible for the reported research. All authors have participated in the concept and the design; analysis and interpretation of data, drafting or revision of the manuscript and they have all approved the manuscript as submitted.
The authors also attest that no conflict of interest exists regarding this work.
The publication is approved by the responsible authorities where the work was carried out. They attest that there has been no financial involvement within the past five years with a commercial organisation that might have any potential interest in the subject or materials discussed in the manuscript.
They also attest that any honorarium, grant, or other form of payment was given to anyone to produce the manuscript.
Please, find a list of suggested reviewers at the bottom of this letter.
I sincerely hope that the reviewing process finds the revised manuscript acceptable for publication.

Yours faithfully
Silvia Iacobelli, MD, PhD
Néonatologie, Réanimation Néonatale et Pédiatrique
Reviewer's report:
Premature born infants show less extra uterine growth retardation if they are fed with higher parenteral and enteral caloric intake. This is proven for VLBW preterm infants but not for moderate LBW preterm infants. In this paper it is suggested that also fin LBW infants better extra-uterine growth can be observed when they are fed with higher intakes. The evidence was obtained by data from questionnaires of 29 French NICU's. The analysis of the data was performed using correct statistical methods. The authors clearly indicate the limitations of the study. Therefore it is difficult to make statements about the optimal level of the AA intake in relation to the total caloric intake. Therefore it is better to leave out statements about the cumulative AA intake like line 217-219. This statement should be limited to: a better nutritional intake.

Answer: Thank you very much for this remark. This statement was modified according to your suggestion and it was changed for “a better nutritional intake” (line 215)

Another aspect that is not clear from this survey is the fact whether or not the use of CVL for aggressive TPN contributes to the incidence of sepsis. It would be nice if this info was available

Answer: Unfortunately, this information was not available. So, we addressed this point in a short sentence, as a limitation of our study (line 270-271).

Overall this paper has important information regarding nutrition education of peri-/ neonatologists.

Reviewer's report:
Thank you for the opportunity to review this well constructed and interesting article. The research question was easily identifiable and understood and was original and well defined. The data appears to be of sound scientific background and estimations and assumptions have been clearly presented. The interpretation is well balanced, and the conclusions are valid and result directly from the data shown. This research adds to the limited available literature in the field of neonatal nutrition.

Major Compulsory Revisions - 0
Minor Essential Revisions - 0

Answer: Thank you very much for your corrections. All suggestions were addressed in the revised version.

Discretionary Revisions - 4
1. Consistent wording throughout the paper, for example,
a) In the Abstract, Line 43, the term "Extra-uterine growth retardation (EUGR)" is used, while in the Background, Line 53, "Extra-uterine growth restriction (EUGR)" is referred to, and
b) In the Background, Line 73, refers to "slightly preterm babies" while the Methods, Line 85, refer to "moderately premature babies" and the Discussion, Line 215, refers once again to "slightly premature population"

Answer: a) Corrected in the background for extra-uterine growth retardation (line 47)
b) corrected for moderately (line 72, 212)
2. In the Results, Line 187, reads “feeding volume was advanced from 9 plus or minus 12ml/kg/d on DOL1” was this a median or a mean?
   **Answer:** That is a mean (added at line 183)
3. In the Discussion, Line 245, "IUGR" should be documented in full as it has not been previously documented in the paper.
   **Answer:** corrected (line 242)
4. The Conclusion, Line 283, refers to "VLBIW" other sections of the paper refer to "VLBW infants"
   **Answer:** corrected (line 281)
**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field