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Reviewer's report:

Comments to the authors

Overall, the authors have appropriately answered my questions. The revised version would be acceptable after addressing a few minor points described below.

1) Table 1 and Table 2: The authors describe that the pulsatility indices (uterine artery, and middle cerebral artery, and umbilical artery) in Table 1 were retrieved at 22-24 weeks of gestation, whereas the same indices in Table 2 were retrieved <24 hours before delivery. It seems strange to adopt the pulsatility indices of different time points among the same patients. Is this correct? Please confirm.

2) Figure 2: The authors describe in the results that laeverin levels were significantly different between different postpartum days. The authors should also mention whether the antepartum leaverin level (time point 0) is significantly deferent from each postpartum level (time point 1, 2, 3, or 4).

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

Yes

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 recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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