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The authors present a retrospective cohort study of diamniotic twin pregnancies comparing those delivered preterm with spontaneous labor using maternal weight gain as a major variable.

Questions for the authors:

1. Please use the term 'spontaneous preterm delivery' instead of 'preterm labor' in the title of the paper.
2. How was the sample size chosen?
3. Why were deliveries prior to 28 weeks excluded?
4. The use of 'pregestational weight' is subject to recall bias. Would the results be different if the first recorded weight in pregnancy were used? Indeed, what was the mean gestational age at enrollment?
5. I recommend the authors include the specific methodology for defining inadequate, average and excessive weight gain referred to in their reference 18 for clarity: "We then divided the IOM lower limit of normal weight gain at 37-42 weeks by 37 to determine the IOM recommended weight gain per week. For normal-weight women, this was 1.0 lb per week (37 lbs over 37 weeks); for overweight women, this was 0.84 lb per week (31 lbs over 37 weeks); for obese women, this was 0.68 lb per week (25 lbs over 37 weeks)."

**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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