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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript addresses the important questions of a) how effective national guidelines are in terms of adherence to the recommendations among the targeted clinics, b) regarding the existence of informal guidelines, and c) the perceived needs of clarifications in future revised guidelines. An appropriate survey design using combined quantitative and qualitative data yielded a sample that allows for generalization in the Swedish setting. The authors have identified a deviation from the guidelines regarding pregnancy dating by ultrasound in week 11-14, and describe a rather great variation of strategies concerning the management of pregnancies with conflicting estimations of date of birth (ultrasound-based versus LMP-based). They call for regular updates and improved implementation of the guidelines.

Some questions/critics:

1. Background line 111: this is hardly an example of the international recommendations mentioned on line 109.

2. Background: The call for improved implementation of guidelines requires further information on how the original implementation was carried out. That could be mentioned briefly in the Background section.

3. Material and Methods: 48 centers were invited and 38 responses were included in the analysis. It would be proper to state a 79% (38/48) response rate instead of 84% (38/43).

4. Results line 192 etc: here the guidelines are described. Those are better placed in the Introduction/Background.

5. Results line 207 etc: the deviant routines regarding early pregnancy ultrasound dating in one region are described but there is no information on the national task force set up 2015 to address the scientific data showing a deterioration which took place following the implementation of the 2010 guidelines (Ref: Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 2017 Feb;96(2):223-232. doi: 10.1111/aogs.13061. Epub 2017 Jan 7].
6. Background line 117: the term 'validity' is not appropriate in this context. Maybe 'reliance' or 'trustworthiness'?

7. Material and Methods line 140: again, avoid 'validity' here to not confuse the reader. Maybe 'accuracy'?

8. Results line 170: Unclear: if 19 (50%) responders declared having shifted from LMP-dating to US-dating between 1980 and 1992 then what about the rest? The finding does not support the conclusion.

9. Discussion line 264: The authors are surprised by the low adherence to early pregnancy dating instructions. Admitting there is a documented and debated problem using certain algorithms might expand the understanding and could be brought into the discussion.

10. Discussion line 357: The definition of pregnancy length is a related issue, however not central to the objectives of this study. There is no survey data to support the recommendation of 40 weeks + 0 days (and the definition requires further discussions about the definitions of LMP and 'completed weeks and days'). This section is better left out.

11. Discussion line 368: Beware to give recommendations if not scientifically based. This is common sense but not automatically part of the survey report.

12. I would recommend to explain the content of Figure 1 and Figure 4 in text only.
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