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Dear Editor,

We are very content with the acceptance by the reviewers of our adjustments in the manuscript to their earlier comments. Thank you for the additional significant comment of the reviewer Justus Hofmeyer. We are once more very pleased for getting the opportunity to improve the protocol for publication. In the second page you will find the answer on the remark from the reviewer. In the protocol, the textual adaptations are indicated by track changes.

We hope you will accept this study protocol for online publication in BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth.

Yours sincerely,

Mallory Woiski, MD, corresponding author

Radboud University Nijmegen
Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology
Huispostnummer 791
P.O.Box 9101
6500 HB Nijmegen
The Netherlands
Tel: +31 2436 14747
Email:M.Woiski@obgyn.umcn.nl
Reviewer's report:

Discretionary Revisions
The authors may wish to consider one additional revision. As I understand the protocol, in the first study of actual practice, participants who do not agree to video recording of the birth will be compared to those who do agree, to assess the effect of video recording on practice. However, as these would be self selected groups, it would be difficult to assume that differences were due to the videorecording. If it is important to the researchers to know the effect of video recording, it would be preferable to study only participants who agree to videorecording, and to randomly allocate them to a group who have videorecording and a group who do not.

The reviewer rightly wonders whether it’s important to the researchers to know the effect of video recording. The answer is no. The effect of video recording on itself is not an independent research question. The purpose of this sentence in the protocol was to indicate that we are aware of the possibility of a bias in the video group. We note that this part in the protocol may be confusing to the readers, therefore we decided to omit this sentence from the text.