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**Reviewer's report:**

The manuscript by Indrio and colleagues investigates attitudes and practices of pediatricians practicing in the Middle East and North Africa regarding infantile colic. The authors use a survey format. The stated aims of their study were to determine the perceived incidence of colic and the main diagnostic and therapeutic interventions used by the regions pediatricians for this condition and to assess the knowledge surrounding the use of probiotics for colic. They met their aims. This study adds new knowledge as colic has not been extensively studied in this region of the world. Also, a strength of this manuscript is the large number of respondents to their survey.

My concerns with the manuscript are listed below:

1. Methods section, page 7 lines 47-51. The authors' statement that "the total number of questionnaires distributed is unknown. A sample of 1628 physicians were invited to participate" is confusing. How were the questionnaires distributed? Isn't the number of distributed questionnaires the same as the number invited to participate? The process of questionnaire distribution needs to be clearly described.

2. Method section, page 7 line 60 to page 8 line 6. The authors mention the use of standard deviation to describe their results, but this measure of variation about the mean is not present in the results or tables. Also, the reason for the utilization of confidence intervals is unclear. A better description of the results would be mean (if normally distributed) or medians with standard deviations or interquartile ranges, respectively. If confidence intervals are used, the authors should include a reason for this choice.

3. Results section, page 8 line 16. 1628. 1628 doctors completed the questionnaire. How does this reconcile with the statement that the same number of physicians were invited to participate? Does this mean there was a 100% response?
4. Results section, page 10 line 9. The authors refer to the use of "cautery." Can this be further defined? Certainly they are not referring to the burning of tissue.

5. The authors should add a more thorough comparison of their findings to those published for other parts of the world. For example, the use of simethicone is far more frequent in the U.S. This would strengthen the manuscript.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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