

Author's response to reviews

Title: Inter- and intra-observer variability in Sonographic measurements of the cross-sectional diameters and area of the umbilical cord and its vessels during pregnancy

Authors:

Cristiane Barbieri (cristianebarbieri@yahoo.com.br)

Jose G Cecatti (cecatti@unicamp.br)

Carla EO Souza (carlasouza@terra.com.br)

Emilio F Marussi (efmarussi@uol.com.br)

Jose V Costa (jvilton@unicamp.br)

Version: 2 **Date:** 7 October 2008

Author's response to reviews: see over

Campinas, 07th October 2008.

Dear Editor of
Reproductive Health
Dr. Regina Kulier

Dear Dr. Kulier

First of all we would like to thank the referees for the careful revision of our article. We are now submitting the reviewed version of the manuscript. Please find below the comments and information regarding the suggestions from the referees:

Referee 1:

1. The "diameters" of the umbilical cord was also included in the title as suggested.
2. The initials of the two examiners plus their qualifications were included in the text.
3. The diameter of the umbilical vessels were initially measured in order to obtain their area when the protocol for this study was written because this was a standard procedure for some authors who have addressed the same topic before (Weissman et al., 1994).
4. It was chosen to measure a single point of the umbilical cord located 2.0cm from the abdominal insertion because this was the standard technique used by Ghezzi et al. (2005, Ref. 16 of the article), which was followed in the protocol of the study. In fact, before doing the measurements, the ultrasonographer did a general evaluation of the umbilical cord in order to detect possible local irregularities in its diameter.

Referee 2:

- The only point the referee 2 suggested was to measure both umbilical arteries instead only one. We now do agree with that recommendation, but unfortunately the study is already finished. Anyway, as pointed out even by the referee, the difference between both arteries is expected to be very low.

I hope to have properly addressed all points. Please contact me if any other question arises.

Sincerely yours

Jose Guilherme Cecatti

Full Professor of Obstetrics

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology

University of Campinas

Campinas, SP, Brazil

Three possible reviewers for this manuscript were:

- Edward Araujo Júnior: araujojed@terra.com.br
- Mladen Predanic: mlp2001@med.cornell.edu
- Axt-Fliedner R: raxtfliedner@hotmail.com