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Reviewer’s report:

In this study, the authors developed a Canadian SES Index for environmental health. The paper is well written and the statistical analyses are appropriate. The authors also raise an important point that single indicators of SES are unlikely to reflect its complexity. The major limitation of the paper is its lack of novelty. The association between SES and adverse birth outcomes has been well documented, and even with the development of the SES index, the findings are pretty much exactly what one would have suspected. Why not use the SES index as a predictor of a health outcome where findings have been mixed or at least less consistent? The authors need to be clear why this study is important, especially with regards to studying a very well documented association between SES and adverse birth outcomes.

Minor Points
- The Background in the abstract is one line and does not convey what the study is about
- There is no objective in the abstract. I needed to read the text before the abstract made sense.
- Be consistent throughout the paper in the spelling of “socioeconomic”
- Spell out the abbreviation of PM 2.5 in the abstract. Most readers will not know that this refers to Particulate Matter.
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