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Reviewer's report:

Quiping Li and co-authors have extensively revised their manuscript, and overall their revisions have significantly improved the paper. Despite their having contacted professionals with regard to grammar and wording, a large number of edits are still required. Unfortunately, the authors do not have more recent comparison data that would make the paper much stronger. They have added details from 2008 in an attempt to make their out-of-date survey results demonstrate changes over time and be more relevant to current neonatal services in China.

Specific edits:

Abstract:

Line 35: Suggest "Lack of equipment" rather than "equipment insufficiency"

Line 37: Suggest "surveyed rather than "investigated"

Line 50 and 52→ Line 7 next page: Suggest "the capacity to provide …"

Line 11: Suggest "well organized or well distributed" instead of "balanced"

Background:

Page 12. Line 39: "…rate has declined significantly…"

Page 12, line 44: delete "as"

Page 12, line 50: suggest deleting "corresponding survey"

Page 13, line 10: "and explore directions for future development of neonatal intensive care"

Methods:
Page 13, line 33: suggest "intensive care capacities" rather than "treatment quality" [this paper does not review the quality of NICU care provided.]

Page 13, line 48 and following: "investigated departments" would be better phrased as "departments surveyed" 24: "…two surveys were largely comparable."

Page 14, line 28-33: What is the comparison being made? [The increases and decreases described are not clear.]

Results:

Page 16, line 13 and following: suggest "surfactant administration" rather than "surfactant replacement"

Page 16, line 43: suggest "provide" or "access" rather than "avail"

Page 16, line 45: Rephrase sub-title. Suggest "Outcomes of preterm infants". Can the authors provide much more details on outcomes?

Page 17, line 43: "were more widely available in 2012 than in 2008."

Discussion:

Page 17, line 48: delete the word "current"

Page 17, line 48: "neonatal departments"

Page 19, line 18: The word "classification" is confusing. Do the authors mean "organization" or "coordinated approach to neonatal intensive care"?

Page 19, lines 41 - 50: The two sentences as written conflict with each other, or are confusing as to reference point for sentence #2.

Page 20, line 31: "…heighten the risks of …"

Page 20, line 44: "phototherapy…"

Page 21, line 12: Suggest "expanding access to" rather than "popularization"

Page 21; line 31 - 33: Suggest "when the proportion of hospitals that could perform newborn transport was significantly higher than in 2008."

Page 22, line 44: suggest "intensive care" rather than "positive treatment"
Page 22, line 48: delete "the"

Page 22, line 50: The authors provide no information for their assumption that there is a negative attitude. A reference and re-phrasing would help make this point.

Page 23, line 20: suggest "efficiently" rather than "rationally"

Page 23, line 24: The authors reflect on a problem of ineffective use of NICU beds because transports do not occur to and out of nICUs. The sentence could be re-phrased to add detail to "transport problem".

Conclusions:

Page 23, line 49: suggest "improve" or "develop" rather than "perfect".
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Yes

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?
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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

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:
1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal.