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Reviewer's report:

This paper describes a study that has clear, delimited goals and provides specific, useful recommendations that are highly relevant for child care settings. I have just a few suggestions:

-- In abstract, the final sentence, "For various reasons, collaboration with a paediatrician may be of additional benefit" is vague and could briefly indicate what reasons, or simply state that many child care centers would benefit from collaboration with a pediatrician.

-- p. 3, first sentence indicates, "In resource-rich settings, 30 to more than 80%..." It's unclear why "resource-rich" is specified or what it means. Does it mean that in non-resource-rich settings, different %s of children are in formal care? The 30-80% range is also very broad.

-- p. 3, line 10 - is there evidence that can be cited that temporary exclusions of ill children reduce disease transmission?

-- p. 4, line 44 - Since reporting from center administrators may be considered human subjects, depending on methods, it would be helpful to clarify whether the IRB indicated the research did not qualify as human subjects research, or whether the decision to not seek IRB approval was the authors' decision.

-- p. 5, line 29 - a two-sided t-test may be the same as a 2-tailed test, I believe. The t-test appears to be an independent samples t-test.

-- p. 11, line 52 - what are conditions that are contagious but do not provide medical indication for temporary exclusion (i.e., referred to as contagious vs contagious and dangerous) (this is likely my own lack of knowledge)

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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:
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