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Very interesting topic and very well written. I'm looking forward to the final review.

Major comments:
1. I believe the title isn't optimal. I would propose the following: "The ability of late pregnancy maternal tests to predict adverse pregnancy outcomes associated with placental dysfunction. A protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis of prognostic accuracy studies."
2. I would propose a subgroup analysis for each outcome comparing studies with different background risk. If the background risk is significantly different between the studies, multiple groups might be needed.
3. It is mentioned that you will assess the risk of bias in each study by using a modified QUADAS-2 tool. Nevertheless, it isn't mentioned how you will test the possible difference between studies with different level of bias. Hence, I propose to conduct either/both a subgroup analysis comparing studies with different level of bias and a sensitivity analysis only including studies with a low risk of bias.
4. It is mentioned that you will include both randomized controlled trials, prospective cohort, and nested case-control studies. However, it isn't mentioned whether you will combine or separate the results of these different study type. I propose to separate them due to the different nature of the different study types. Moreover, a subgroup analysis should be conducted for each outcome to compare the results of the different study types.

Minor comments:
1. Line 45, lacks an 'and': UK Clinical Trials Gateway, AND WHO International Clinical Trials Portal
2. Line 73: I believe the comma should be after "in the UK".
3. Line 92: I believe the comma should be removed.
4. Line 221-223: You mention "Note we would only include pre-eclampsia diagnosed after measurement of the predictor - so beyond 24 weeks' gestation]. This has already been mentioned in line 199-201. Please remove the one at line 221-223. Moreover, shouldn't it say "will" instead of "would"?
5. You might also search LILACS, SCOPUS, and clinicaltrials.gov.
6. Line 298: I believe the comma should be removed.
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