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Reviewer's report:

Major comments:

1. Why did the authors select and analyze only Streptococcus mutans and Lactobacillus? As you know, periodontitis is associated with preterm birth. Also, periodontal pathogens such as Porphyromonas gingivalis is associated with oxidative stress. Why didn't you analyze periodontal pathogens? Please explain about this.

2. Page 11: The association between bacterial colonization of oral cavity and oxidative stress / total antioxidant capacity is unclear. Please discuss about it with reference to other literatures.

3. Page 12: "OS was found to be 16 % higher in the saliva of pregnant women compared to nonpregnant women." Please discuss about this result with reference to other literatures.

Minor comments:

1. Page 2, Results: Please describe the official name of "ABTS".

2. Page 4, Methods: Please describe that non-pregnant controls was age matched with pregnant group.

3. Page 9, TAC in saliva: "The average ABTS radical scavenging capacity in the saliva of pregnant women were 46% lower comparing to that of non-pregnant women (OD732: 0.118 ± 0.01 vs 0.063 ± 0.02)." Is the Figure 3 correct? Please check.

4. Page 14, Abbreviations: Please add "ABTS" and "OD".

5. Table 1: You should describe "p<0.05" instead of "p=<0.05". Also, what is the difference between * and **?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No
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.

No

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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