Reviewer’s report

Title: Arabin Cervical Pessary for Prevention of Preterm Birth in Cases of Twin-to-twin Transfusion Syndrome Treated by Fetoscopic LASER Coagulation: The PECEP LASER Randomised Controlled Trial

Version: 1 Date: 15 Nov 2016

Reviewer: Mounira Habli

Reviewer’s report:

Thanks alot for allowing me to participate in review this important original article. In summary Rodo etal is proposing an open label randomized clinical trial to investigate whether a prophylactic cervical pessary will lower the incidence of preterm delivery in cases of twin-twin transfusion syndrome requiring fetoscopic laser coagulation. The trial involves two arms pessary vs expectant management. Patient will be randomized prior to SFLP if they are eligible and the intervention (pessary will be inserted after SFLP regardless of cervical length). During the trial cervical cerclage or progesterone will not be allowed in any case during the rest of the pregnancy.

Comments:

Background well written.

Methods:

Aims: Well done

Participants: The exclusion criteria should be more detailed as: Are the authors including patient that are dilated cervix as>2 cm, TTTS with selective IUGR, patient who have documented contraction on monitor ...etc.

intervention: The author mentioned that cerclage should not be introduced for study patient. What are indications for cerclage in patients who failed pessary. Define pessary failure. Is cerclage will be offered for patient with physical exam dilated cervix esp if failed pessary. Esp after the article that is published in Jan 2016 in AJOG about twin cerclage in physical exam indicated patient vs. expectant management statistics, interim analysis and discussion all are appropriately written.

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 am able to assess the statistics

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