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Reviewer’s report:

It is a experimental study evaluating the effect of Pravastatin in the NO action in placenta comparing normal with preeclampsia cases. It is as very interesting approach. However, the way the authors are showing the results is confusing. Overall the manuscript should be re-written, with a flow text and definitely proof read.
Below I introduce some comments.

Abstract
You start you abstract with "Impact of Pravastatin". When you say impact, you need to explain impact in what. I understand what you mean; however the way it is written is not clear. You also need to explain what "NO" means for the reader.
The methods section is incomplete. You need to explain what type of study, population, period of data collection and statistical analyses.
At the results you included the co-treatment with Geldanamycin. This should be before in methods.

Key words: I suggest including Placenta.

Background.
You start saying that preeclampsia is the leading cause of maternal mortality. However hemorrhage is the leading cause in the world. If you have another data, you should include where preeclampsia is the leading cause of maternal mortality.
Again you need to explain what NO is at the text.
Paragraph 3. I suggest including a graph with all these mechanism for better understanding since is the main explanation for your manuscript.
Overall all the information at background is good. However, is disconnected and confusing. I suggest rephrase the background linking the paragraphs and the information. I also suggest including the safety of using statins during pregnancy.

Methods
There is some repeated information. You should explain how was the selection of the placentas, if it was sequential cases, the worst ones, or randomly.
Otherwise, you need to include how the clinical information was collected. Interviews? Medical records? Women signed the informed consent? Agreed to participate at the study?
What is not clear for me is when did you include Pravastatin? The pregnant women with preeclampsia took them or did you include at your experimental phase? I know that you used during the experiments, however must be very well explained at methods.

Results:
Again, there is some information repeated.
The definition of preeclampsia should be at methods. The figures should include footnotes with the explanation of the * symbols. It is still not clear. The figure 1A is the control - ok. And the figure 1B you compare with the inclusion of Pravastatin? Am I right? So, the legend for figures 1A and 1B are confusing. Also, the results should no be at the legend but described in results. Also, you need to introduce the figures before show the results: Figure 1A shows… and we found….

Discussion
I suggest that the discussion could be written with the following information: Summarize primary findings of your study/ Discuss two to three interesting findings/ Strengths/limitations/ Next steps/ Conclusions. I also suggest you to discuss how the differences in gestational age could (or not) have influenced the results.

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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