Reviewer’s report

Title: Intra- versus retroplacental hematomas: A retrospective case-control study on pregnancy outcomes

Version: 0 Date: 24 Jul 2016

Reviewer: Gianpaolo Maso

Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript is well written and very original because it assessed the clinical implications of IUH according with its location (intra/retroplacental). However I have some queries that need to be clarified before drawing the Authors’ conclusions

Major revision

Parameters analyzed- statistical analyses


2. The clinical outcomes are well defined, however it is unclear to me whether you considered previous IUGR and abruptio placentae in the multivariate logistic regression model?

3. Why did not you assess the multivariate logistic regression model to predict the risk of preterm delivery? Please specify if IUH increased the risk of PTD independently of its location

Results

1. Did you consider the gestational age at diagnosis in the predictive model of adverse outcome? This key point is very important because prognosis may differ according to first or second trimester diagnosis (i.e. Xiang L et al. Symptoms of an intrauterine hematoma associated with pregnancy complications: a systematic review. PLoS One. 2014 Nov 4;9(11):e111676 / Maso e al. First trimester intrauterine hematoma and outcome of pregnancy. Obstet Gynecol 2005; 105: 339-344)

Discussion

Please provide any other different conclusion according to the replies to reviewer's queries
Minor revision

Table 1. Please provide the list of abbreviations used (i.e. SIH?)

Please replace Intraurine Growth Retardation with Fetal or Intrauterine Growth Restriction in the manuscript

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:
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