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In this manuscript Pant et al seek to assess the levels of sFlt1 and PlGF (or ratio of the two) in a cohort of patients with established preeclampsia compared to normal pregnant women.

I have some comments for the authors:

1) It would be important to reference papers that have shown sFlt1/PlGF is a useful 'rule-out' test for the prediction of women who will develop preeclampsia at term - to highlight that these markers are already thought of highly within the field of preeclampsia prediction

2) More detailed methods are required - including which company the ELISAs were sourced from - intra and inter-assay variability or %CV, whether samples were run in single or duplicate and if QCs were included.

3) It is not usual to state a p value as 0.000 as shown in table 2- perhaps the use of <0.001 or the like is warranted if the data is highly significant.

4) The analyte data would be more easily interpreted with the use of scatter plots and ROC curves so that the reader can appreciate the spread of the data rather than simply having all data listed in tabular format.

5) Table 2 refers to correlations - perhaps R2 values could be provided?

6) Statistics - I cannot find any details around what stats were used for all of the comparisons - this is important to include
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