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Reviewer’s report:

1. This is a potentially very important publication. However there are major deficiencies that require attention. The definition for vitamin D deficiency is not what is accepted by most of the literature. The Institute of medicine concluded that for maximum bone health a blood level should be at least 20 ng/mL and the Endocrine Society's Practice Guidelines recommended for maximum bone health a level should be above 30 ng/mL. It would be very important to note what percent of these children had blood levels <10, 11-20, 21-29 and those above 30 ng/mL. They should then relate their outcome measures to these quartiles. The authors provide no information on the range of blood levels. It's quite possible that all of these infants were vitamin D deficient or insufficient raising questions about their conclusion.

2. Did the authors measure PTH which would have been very helpful?

3. The authors used the term vitamin D levels when presumably they mean vitamin D status or 25-hydroxyvitamin D levels since they did not measure vitamin D levels? This should be corrected throughout the manuscript.
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