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Reviewer's report:

Thanks to the authors for the opportunity to read their interesting paper. Please note I am an epidemiologist and do not have knowledge of the laboratory procedures used so cannot comment on their validity or conduct.

BACKGROUND
p4 line 4: Preeclampsia is a leading cause of maternal mortality, not the leading cause (that is postpartum haemorrhage)
p4 line 40: The authors could more clearly describe the pilot study they are referring to - patients at high risk for pre-eclampsia? It is unclear.
p4 line 43: A definition or explanation of placental microsomes would be useful. They are discussed throughout but not once explained.

METHODS
p4 line 56-60: repetition of methods previously described in section 1.

RESULTS
In general, I think the results should be presented in a table as well as graphically so the reader can clearly see means, p-values and SDs in one place. This may be personal preference but I feel it would make the data easier to interpret.
I found it quite hard to follow the results, this may be my inexperience of the type of experiment conducted but I do think the authors could more clearly describe their findings. Perhaps a more detailed description of results in the text would help.
p6 line 2-5: Clinical definitions and inclusion criteria should be moved to the methods section
p6 line 21-24: It is unclear what data are being described here - Figure 2?
p6 line 28-33: I think this section is supposed to reference figures 3A and 3B rather than 2A and 2B. Apologies if I missed something.
p6 line 40: I think this is meant to be Figure 4, not 3.

DISCUSSION:
I think this section would benefit from discussion this study's findings first, then those of others reported in the literature.
I feel the results are overstated. No study limitations are discussed. Potential selection bias, small sample size, measurement error?
p7 line 33-36: The authors should not make recommendations for clinical practice, their study is a small ex-vivo experiment.
p7 line 46: It is unclear what the authors mean when they say 'our results of arginine uptake account for previous observations on the effect of statins'. Please expand on this point or clarify. Apologies for my misunderstanding.
TABLE AND FIGURES
Table 1 has no title and blood pressure has no units. The figures and table lack a key. It is unclear what the symbols and abbreviations represent. The figure descriptions contain text describing the results which is repeated in the main results section. I don't think it is needed here. These are repeated in the figure descriptions too. It would be better to describe the figure itself rather than the results.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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.

Unable to assess

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:
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