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Kolding Hospital

6000 Kolding

Denmark

Editorial Office

BMC Pediatrics

Dear Sir

Thank you very much for the review and feedback of the paper: “Cerebral disorders in the first 7 years of life in children born post-term: A cohort study”. Below we have answered the questions and commented on the concerns raised by the reviewers.
Reviewer 1:

1. I do believe it would be important to add information in the methods section regarding how representative the source population is of the target population. I agree with the author that it is sufficient, based on his response to my previous comment, but his comments should be added to the manuscript.

This has been added to the manuscript as suggested (page 4, line 89).

2. Results: An odds ratio with 95% confidence interval starting at 1 (e.g. 1.00 to 1.70) is not statistically significant as it includes the reference value (1). I would thus scratch the word "significantly" where there is an overlap in confidence interval and 1. In essence this is hair-splitting as both a CI of 0.98 to X and one which is 1.02 to X describe a very similar difference, but the terms should be used correctly.

This has been changed (on page 2, line 45 – 46 and page 8, line 193, and in the Interpretation section).

Reviewer 2:

3. Revision of the written English is needed.

An English speaking colleague has read and corrected the manuscript.

4. Abstract section lines 43-45. Please revise the written English because this sentence is not clear.

The sentence has been revised (and changed as advised by reviewer 1).

5. Introduction section, please state that hypothesis that moved you to make this study.

We are not clear what this comment mean. However, dealing with pregnant women and newborn children we do need to have as much knowledge as possible to being able to advice future parents. On page 4, line 81 we have stated: “The association between neurological complications and post-term deliveries is thus uncertain. Therefore, further studies are needed in order to formulate evidence-based recommendations to those, who are responsible for the obstetric management of pregnancies exceeding into the post-term period.”
6. Methods: why did you make both logistic regression and Cox regression on the Table 2b?

We agree that Cox regression is the analyses most appropriate and have changed both Table 2b and 3b accordingly. Furthermore, this has been changed in the method section, too.

7. In the table 1 what do you men with "Pr"?

“Pr = Probability of random distribution by chi²”. However, as this term can give some confusion we have changed to the commonly used p instead (in Table 1).

We hope that you find the changes in the paper to be in accordance with your wishes and find the manuscript acceptable for publication in BMC Pediatrics.

Yours sincerely

Poul-Erik Kofoed