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Reviewer’s report:

General Comment:

The authors described about bacterial microflora diversity in infants saliva by difference of delivery route. The authors found microflora diversity by using checker board DNA-DNA hybridization method from total of 148 samples then concluded mode of delivery plays a role in the composition of the oral biofilm during the first 6 months.

Experimental design of this study is sufficient.

I think more deep discussion about microflora diversity and family characteristics relationship makes this study better.

Specific Comment:

1) Did authors estimated mothers periodontal tissue condition before and after delivery?

2) Did authors calculate total number of bacteria in infant samples? If the authors can present total number of bacterial data, it is big help to understand development of microflora diversity.

3) Can the authors show mother's DNA hybridization data at each time point? This is good help to understand Table 5 data.

4) P7 L12

Does the authors meant "A. nucleatum" for "A. naeslundii"?

5) P7 L13

According to Table 4, L. salivarious is also detected in V group only.

6) Table 3.

Do you have any idea about relationship between "introduced food-tasting", "Teeth present" and "oral cleaning" and bacterial diversity?
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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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