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Reviewer's report:

1. Will the study design adequately test the hypothesis?
   yes

2. Are sufficient details provided to allow replication of the work or comparison with related analyses: if not, what is missing?
   Yes, sufficient details are given

3. Is the planned statistical analysis appropriate?
   It seems that it is appropriate

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?
   Yes/not applicable

5. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes but it could be improved further

The authors clearly present the protocol for the PESPAPRO trial which aims to reduce the risk for preterm birth in asymptomatic women with a short cervix using vaginal progesterone versus cervical pessary in this population – both accepted therapies that so far have not been compared.

This is a non-commercial, multicenter, open label, randomized clinical trial (in a ratio 1:1 daily vaginal progesterone or cervical pessary), including 254 women at 29 participating hospitals in Spain. The scientific background and methods are well described.

Minor Essential Revisions

Several language issues exist, I suggest to have the manuscript checked by a native speaker or professional service (minor spelling errors: progesterona, spaces missing before references, „on march“, „have been founded“, missing or double full stops etc.)