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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript is interesting.

There are still some questions.

1. Ultrasonography is a useful tool not only for obstetric patients but also for obstetric management.

2. "Accurate determination of gestational age has posed great challenge to patient management as the accuracy of traditional biometric parameters decreases with advance in gestation age." is difficult to understand. What does "traditional biometric parameters" mean? Why does the accuracy of traditional biometric parameters drop with advance in gestation age? And I think it maybe better adding an abbreviation of "GA" for "gestational age". Or, "GA" should not be used in "Conclusion".

3. "This study is aimed to create…" maybe more suitable. And, I think why create baseline reference values of fetal kidney lengths should be point out.

4. In "Methods", the measuring method should be point out. It is ultrasound.

5. What does "Both kidney lengths are highly reproducible with excellent correlation and agreement within and between sonographers." mean?

6. The second sentence in "Result" is also difficult to understand. It maybe should be revised.

7. The storytelling is not well organized in "Background" and "Discussion".

8. There are too many errors of logic and language in the whole manuscript.

9. I think the idea is good, but the writing is terrible.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No
**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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

Yes

**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:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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