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**Reviewer’s report:**

Wood et al. have investigated impact of vaginal progesterone (200mg) for prevention of preterm birth in women with arrested premature labor. The study initially targeted 60 patients to include in their study, but Only 41 women were enrolled in the trial due to several reasons explain the results section of the manuscript. One of the reasons is that the provider changed its progesterone product. It is important to know why the product is changed? Was the progesterone product used in the study was not effective or is the new progesterone product was an alternative formulation, or same chemical structure but new lot? Even if the new progesterone product is alternative progesterone formulation it should not be a reason to terminate the study as this study also included meta-analyses of studies used 17-hydroxyprogesterone caporate. These should be clarified in the text to better explain the termination reason.

Below, I also suggest some minor changes.

In the abstract section:

- Include patient number analyzed in the clinical trial part of this study.
- Spell out "RCTs" in Selection Criteria.

**Introduction Section:**

- Introduction section is very short. It may include a paragraph describing pathogenic mechanisms of premature birth and/or progesterone levels during pregnancy and term and premature labor etc.

**Results Section:**

- Meta-analysis: Ultimately, 18 trials (including ours) were identified and 14 were included in the meta-analysis. 4 trials were excluded from meta-analysis (exclusion reasons are given for 3), It not clear why the 4th one was excluded.

**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.
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Quality of written English
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