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PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (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?
Yes - the approach is appropriate

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

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Yes - current version is technically sound

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: The authors responded to every question that the reviewer raised and made changes to reflect their responses in the manuscript itself. This manuscript is now much more readable and consistent. There are just a few inconsistencies/errors need to be modified. There is also a strong statement that the reviewer does not agree. The reviewer suggests the authors remove that statement. The reviewer does not need to review this manuscript again.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

1. Inconsistencies
   a. Page 11, paragraph 3, line 4. At 10 months, significant associations are all > 0.075. This is a typo. And by looking at the table, the significant associations are all > 0.65 (not 0.075).
   b. From Table 1, SATCo reactive at 11 month is significantly associated with supine sub-score, but this is not mentioned in the abstract.
   c. From Table 1, SATCo static at 12 month is significantly associated with sitting sub-score, but this is not mentioned in the abstract.

2. Error
   a. Table 1 title, take out the word "median". Statistics should be performed on a set of SATCo scores, not just the median score.

3. Strong statement that the reviewer does not agree. Please remove this statement.
   a. The total AIMS score, being the sum of the four sub-scores, is not a valid dependent variable.
   b. AIMS total score is always a valid variable, but it is just not your focus of analysis.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

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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