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Reviewer's report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

I noticed just a few additional things that might improve the manuscript.

1. in the abstract, the authors might want to report the association of each weekly fish meal rather than each monthly fish meal with gestation length.

2. Page 5. lines 8-9. How many French women had an ultrasound within the first trimester of pregnancy?

3. Page 5, lines 16-, and elsewhere in ms. Please include units for all numbers, e.g. years for age, kg/m2 for BMI, etc.

4. Page 7. while the association of fish consumption with gestation length is statistically significant, a change of 0.02 weeks isn't very clinically relevant. The authors should include this comment.

5. Page 7. Discussion. Please do not include any new results in the discussion. e.g the 3rd and 5th sentences of the discussion.

6. Page 9. The difference in the magnitude of the association with gestation length, compared with prior studies, may also be because fish intake was assessed pre-pregnancy in the present study.

7. Table 1. I don't quite understand why table 1 was submitted as a supplementary file. It should be included with the manuscript.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely
related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.