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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

The selection and inclusion of the study population is not clear. I would suggest to add a flowchart.

Methods: line 93 and on are Results. Please move to the Results section.

I have some problems with a mean cervical length (measured by VE). No one will measure 4.7. What would be the effect on the results if you only use the median in the analyses?

The fact that the time between the two measurements (ultrasound and VE) is lacking/not registered can cause bias to the results.

Minor Essential Revisions:
Please add in Methods the method of the intra observer ICC
References: not all complete or in the right style: i.e. nr 25

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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