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Reviewer's report:

This is a well performed retrospective report on the outcome of limb-malformations in a tertiary centre in Vienna. I think information about location/level should be in the title; ie "Perinatal outcomes of infants with congenital limb malformations: an observational study from a tertiary centre in Vienna"

I find that the expression "Perinatal outcomes are not well understood" is not quite covering the situation; the etiology, classification and reports are differing, and this study help to some extent in entangling these problems.

As is stated in the EUROCAT reference "Survival to 1 week and 1 year varies enormously between countries mainly because of different legislation regarding termination". This calls for some explanation for the reader about the system in Austria: Are all women offered a first or second trimester ultrasound screening? What are the rules for termination of pregnancies, what is the upper limit of gestational age.

I notice that the mean GA when the malformation is diagnosed is 20+5, this seems to be quite late, and could maybe be given a comment?

On page 8, line 179it is stated that "It can be suggested that there is a high rate of induced abortion in pregnancies with congenital limb malformation", I think this needs a modification as this applies to the possibly quite selected group seen at the tertiary centre. They also seem to have a very high rate of syndromes (63,5%) 

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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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