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1. Abstract: The statement that individuals born with low birth weight have a reduced likelihood to reproduce is not accurate. In the deKeyser population study women born small for gestational age had a statistically increased rate of reproduction in the age 25-27 group. This age is not substantially different from the age range in the present study so the hypothesis of low reproductive efficiency is not reasonable for this study.

2. The authors indicate that at the initial recruitment 27 of 38 VLBW subjects were SGA but not the proportion in the group that actually participated.

3. In the study the proportion of VLBW women with children was not different from the control group so results of the hormone measurements cannot be related to low reproductive efficiency.

4. Table 2 does not show the number of subjects included. Was this 24 in all cases?

5. Table 3: The age at which samples were obtained should be indicted and information on the day of the last menstrual period. It was not reasonable to conduct a study in which so few of the subjects would be available for hormone testing. As a result of having no information on the menstrual cycle and so few subjects, the power of the test is too low to report.
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