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Reviewer’s report:

This is a relatively large study that addresses the possible source of oral bacteria variability during birth, comparing vaginal and caesarian births. And the results are of interest. I recommend publication if the notes below can be addressed. In particular need to know using this method how reproducible technical replicates are. It is good the authors discuss the shortcomings of the checkerboard methodology for bacteria identification and quantitation. It would be beneficial to confirm their results by a second method such as 16s rDNA amplification and sequencing. Or at least showing how reproducible the checkerboard methodology is in their hands. The authors say they had high threshold levels of detection to better insure accuracy, however, they need to show at least for some samples that technical replicates tested with the checkerboard methodology come out the same. It would also be good to describe the methodology a little more completely in the methods section.

Table 5 on correlation between mothers and child is very interesting. Authors may want to discuss the results more.

Line 36, Page 6 "The prevalence of S. sanguinis, R. denticariosa, B. dentinum and V. parvula increased with age in both groups but the prevalence was significantly lower in the CS group (p<0.05)." Chic square test used as stated. Were the values high enough to warrant this test? And needs to be more identification in table 4 of what differences are statistically significant.

Page 7 "A third possible bias was the relatively high attrition of the material during the course of the study, and we can only speculate on its possible influence on the results" line 50 I am not sure what this means. Is this talking about subject dropouts, sample quality on storage? I am not sure. Please clarify.
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