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PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are minor issues

Statistics - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

No - there are issues with the statistics in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions
GENERAL COMMENTS: valuable pooled analysis on neonatal care in a big country with emerging economy characteristics

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

May I suggest that the text will be verified by a native English speaking colleague (I'm neither English speaking), but not sure if 'populous' and 'developmental status of neonatal department' is the best phrasing?

What the authors provide is a 'snapshot' on the currently available infrastructure and neonatal capacity, specific to neonatal (intensive) care, so not covered 'basic neonatal care'.

I also suggest to explain what the authors mean with 'mainland' China.

Can the authors provide information on the NICU level I-IV availabilities?

I was somewhat surprised by the doctor/bed to nurse/bed ratio, and are the any guidelines on the 'level of training' needed to work within the N(I)CU setting?

What do the authors mean with the 'ability of performing intra-uterine transport': is the availability of a dedicated transport team used an criterion?

One conclusion drawn on the 'unbalanced' availability may be better illustrated by providing some data on the ratio bed/population or bed/number of deliveries between different regions? Is this solution 'only' to set up a neonatal classification system, but also to be creative (short stabilization units, out of hospital teams like 'search and rescue' teams?)

Introduction: please check the mortality rate (33% or 33‰)? 33 percent of 33 pro mille? and perhaps the decrease is more likely related to better perinatal care and better newborn care, with the development of neonatal departments as a tool to achieve this?

Sorry to read that the survey has been done in 2012, it almost calls for an update.

Can the authors provide information on the age used of prematurity and extreme preterm birth?

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

cf mentioned earlier

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**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.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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