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Reviewer's report:

In this manuscript, Tveit et al. demonstrated that consensus-based intervention to decreased fetal movement (DFM) perceived by the mother significantly reduced stillbirth rate. This intervention increased the use of ultrasound, but not the rate of emergency cesarean section. I believe that this study may contribute to dealing with pregnant women with DFM. Furthermore, the attached brochure “Kicks count” is beautifully written, and thus this brochure may be well applicable in any other institutes; this also may be useful.

However, I would like to suggest some minor modifications. I believe that my advice may be of some help in making this manuscript better.

Minor essential revisions

1 Introduction section consisted of 8 paragraphs. It is too voluminous. Please shorten this part, with the point being focused. You need not describe all detailed data (numerical data) obtained in the previous studies.

The part regarding the agreement of the hospital and the mother (the last paragraph of Introduction section, page 6, lines 14-16) should be moved to Methods section.

2 Page 6, line 4 from the bottom: Please cite reference of Femina. If you have no reference, please describe so.

3 Discussion section consists of 8 paragraphs.

Please indicate that 5th paragraph (page 13, first line; The lowered overall stillbirth rates,...) is a new paragraph, if it is so.

The 2nd paragraph deals with limitation/weakness of this study. This may look quite peculiar to the readers. Please move this paragraph at least to the latter part of the Discussion section, usually to the second paragraph from the last. Weakness of the study should not be too emphasized. Rather, strength of this study should appear forward (in the new second or third paragraph), then cite Grant et al’s famous study (ref 31), then limitation, and then conclusion. I believe that 5 paragraphs may be enough for the present Discussion. I mean that the present 8 paragraphs should be shortened. Readers interested in this issue (DFM) already know the things described in the present manuscript. So, here once again, I would like the authors to shorten the Discussion section as I have advised regarding Introduction section. The shorter, the better, as long as one
can tell the things accurately. I believe so.

4 Please insert comma in page 12, line 8 from the bottom (the risk of stillbirth [26, 28-30], a large cluster-randomized ,,,,).
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