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Reviewer's report:

While this topic remains important, and there are strengths to the approach, my support for this manuscript remains limited. I appreciate the authors’ efforts to respond to my suggestions. Concerns remain in both scientific and writing aspects of this study.

1. One of the premises of this paper is that outcomes for twin pregnancies, specifically preterm delivery. However, preterm delivery was examined in:


It is understandable that this study was planned and conducted before these other studies were published, but they need to be acknowledged.

Therefore, the conclusion that, "The present study represents, to the best of our knowledge, the first report evaluating if and how weight gain according to pre-gestational BMI, proposed by IOM revised guidelines, has an influence on the development of spontaneous PD in twin pregnancies," is problematic in two ways. First, a quick search identified several studies that examined weight gain in twin pregnancies and PD. Second, this study only examines "if," not "how" (i.e., there is not an examination of mechanisms).

2. It would be helpful to include the rates of induction and c-section in the manuscript itself, not just in the response to reviewers, so that all readers may understand this potential for bias and how this may impact generalizability to their own setting. I am still concerned about bias, if these procedures are associated with pBMI and/or gestational weight gain.
3. End of second paragraph of materials: it would be helpful to be more specific and state that there are not IOM recommendations for underweight patients pregnant with twins, because there are for singletons, which makes this sentence confusing as written.

4. Table 3: why not include actual p-values (as in other tables) instead of "ns"?

5. Writing weaknesses
   * Continued awkward writing: "overweighted" and "cuts-off"
   * Short (1 to 2 sentence) paragraphs remain
   * Abbreviations should be spelled out on first use (INES, ACOG)
   * Significant digits (hundredths of grams in weight implies greater precision than seems likely in these measurements)
   * References have multiple errors in formatting

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:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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