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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript.

The study compares Leipold's manoever with ultrasound to estimate fetal weight.

The paper is well written, the research question and methodology are sound.

A few mandatory corrections:

- Please specify how you determined gestational age. It is stated in the methods that some mothers were < 37 weeks but the title specifies Term gestation. Were these mothers excluded?

- Please explain how you determined your sample size.

- How long after the estimation of fetal size were the babies delivered? It is stated in your methods that the actual birth weight was the gold standard. A long interval between fetal weight estimation and delivery would impact on the results. Ideally the weight estimation and delivery should occur on the same day.

- Strengths and limitations is generally presented after the discussion of the main findings - before the conclusion.
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:

Acceptable
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