# Response to Reviewer 1

Dear Reviewer 1

Thank you so much for your time and effort in the evaluating out manuscript. Your comments and suggestions were carefully read and help us to improve the quality of our paper.
We will respond to your suggestions below, point by point. All responses and changes in the text will be highlighted in red.
With all our gratitude,
On behalf of all authors,
Anca Maria Cimpean

Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to review this work. The topic is really interesting.
Thank you for your appreciation. Yes, we also consider that the topic is interesting due to the lack of data regarding podoplanin distribution and function in the human placenta, and human embryo. For other species podoplanin assessement during embryonic and placental development is highly extensive but, in humans, due to the gap in between clinical and preclinical research, podoplanin is related mostly to preeclampsia but few data about its expression in human normal placenta are available.

- Several typographical errors should need to be corrected.
All are corrected by using professional software for spelling and grammar check.
- All abbreviations should have been provided in full on the first mention and this applies to the title, running (short) title, abstract, impact statement, main text, and each table/figure independently as they will be read independently. Please use the abbreviations correctly and effectively. So, all the abbreviations should be checked (i.e. IHC, etc.).

Done, thanks for the observation.

- The introduction section is insufficient. The point of this section is to present a complete picture of the state of the field, as this will help explain how your study builds on previous work. Please explain the purpose of the study comprehensively.

Thank you for your valuable observation. We extensively revised the introduction section and we sharply stated the purpose of the study. PLease find all these coreections highlghted in red in the manuscript text.

- The inclusion and exclusion criteria of the participants are not clear. It should be specified. Please write the features of the study group more comprehensively.

We added a detailed inclusion and exclusion criteria related to both patients and methods used in the present study

- How did you design your study (prospectively, retrospectively, etc.)? Please write it in the methods section.

This is a retrospective study. We added this mention in the material and methods section.

- The discussion section of the manuscript is insufficient. Please discuss your findings; explain the significance of those results and tie everything back to the research question. You wrote it like a narrative review.
- Practical implications and future research direction are not mentioned. Please discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results.
Based on your valuable comments we completely re-wrote the Discussion section. PLease see this inside the manuscript.

- Please write the strengths and limitations of this study.
We added the strenghts and limitations of the study, thank you!

---