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1. The authors excluded women with certain comorbidities (see Box 1 in the article). Discuss whether you agree or disagree with the comorbidities they chose and whether there are any comorbidities you would add or delete. How might differences in this list affect the interpretation of their results?

2. This randomized controlled trial was not masked (blinded). Discuss the reasons for masking and how the inability to mask in this study might limit the findings.

3. Discuss the authors’ choice of the primary outcome. What are the pros and cons of a composite outcome, as compared to a single outcome. Discuss an outcome detected on ultrasonography (detection of fetal growth or fluid abnormalities), as opposed to a clinical outcome (maternal or neonatal outcomes). What are the relative advantages and disadvantages of each outcome type. How does the choice of primary outcome affect the required sample size as well as the applicability of this study to clinical practice?

4. In the routine care group, there were 58 ultrasonograms in 101 women (less than 1 per woman) from randomization until delivery. Is this frequency similar to your own practice or institution for uncomplicated pregnancies? If not, how might the findings affect the applicability of this study to your own practice?

5. Based on the results of this study, discuss whether you will recommend routine ultrasonograms in the third trimester. If yes, or if you already recommend this, what part(s) of the study specifically are compelling? If no, why not?

6. If you were to design a follow-up study to this one, discuss what study you would design. What if you had nearly unlimited resources? What if you had to do the study at your own institution?