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**Reviewer's report:**

This study reports changes in serum sFlt1 and PIGF in patients with preeclampsia and controls from Nepalese populations. Some suggestions for the authors.

1. It may worthwhile for the authors to describe the clinical details of the patients studied in this paper as a separate table. For example, parity, BMI, maternal age, birthweight, delivery indication etc needs to be included so readers can be made aware of the population characteristics.

2. Proteinuria by dipstick is more of qualitative measure. For formal quantitation, one needs 24 hour protein or urine protein/creatinine ratio. In the absence of a formal urinary protein quantitation - correlational analyses is meaningless.

3. Assays to measure sFlt1 and PIGF needs greater detail in the methods section. Was this manual assay and if so, details of the vendor and CVs for the assays need to provided.

4. Besides studying severe PE (which is mostly based on BP criteria), it may worthwhile to correlate these angiogenic factors with adverse maternal and fetal outcomes such as fetal growth restriction, preterm delivery, HELLP syndrome etc

5. How was the sample size calculated for the study?

**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.
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