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Reviewer reports:

Brent R. Collett (Reviewer 1): The authors have addressed most of my earlier comments. A few follow-up suggestions:

1. Appreciate the citations re: treatment fidelity ... both should be cited in the manuscript (I don’t see the Lennartsson paper "Integrating new knowledge ..." in the reference list).

"INTEGRATING NEW KNOWLEDGE......." IS NOW CITED IN THE MANUSCRIPT IN THE BACKGROUND SECTION, PAGE 3, LAST PARAGRAPH, LINE 9 AND ALSO IN THE REFERENCE LIST AS REFERENCE 12.

I agree that these surveys help to assess parents’ awareness and nurses’ reported delivery of intervention, but would not address changes in parent behavior or what interventionists actually did. This should be added as a limitation.

NOT ADDRESSING CHANGES IN PARENT BEHAVIOR OR WHAT INTERVENTIONISTS ACTUALLY DID ARE NOW INCLUDED IN THE LIMITATION SECTION, PAGE 14, LINE 8.
2. The authors added a comment noting that the two settings were similar ... this would of course be much more compelling if there were data/some empirical comparison (e.g., similar SES in the two communities, similar patient populations in terms of pre-term birth, NICU, etc.)

PATIENT POPULATIONS WERE SIMILAR IN TERMS OF MEAN BIRTH WEIGHT (3610 INTERVENTION GROUP AND 3651 CONTROL GROUP. WE HAVE NOW INCLUDED THIS IN THE METHOD SECTION, SETTING, PARTICIPANTS AND GROUP ALLOCATION, PAGE 4, LINE 3-4.

Deborah A. McNeil, PhD, RN (Reviewer 2): The changes made by the authors have improved the clarity of the manuscript. I just have three comments.

1. I continue to disagree with the authors of identifying a result as different either lower or higher if the statistical results do not corroborate the statement even if there is clinical relevance.

WE HAVE BEEN MORE CAREFUL IN DRAWING CONCLUSIONS. SEE CONCLUSIONS SECTION IN THE ABSTRACT AND ALSO PAGE 14 LINES 2-4 WHERE WE ONLY IDENTIFY RESULT DIFFERENCES FOR EARLY REVERSAL WHICH WERE STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT.

2. I think there needs to be mention in the limitations that there was no validation of the scoring system.

NO VALIDATION OF THE SCORING SYSTEM IS NOW INCLUDED IN THE LIMITATIONS SECTION, PAGE 14 LINE 7.

3. The recruitment section is improved but I would have liked to have known the number of eligible infants not just that all those born were eligible

NUMBER OF ELIGIBLE INFANTS IS NOW INCLUDED IN METHODS SECTION, SETTING, PARTICIPANTS AND GROUP ALLOCATION, PAGE 4, LINE 18.