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Reviewer's report:

Discretionary Revisions

1. Given the revisions that the authors have made (in the title and a substantive shift towards a focus on the quality of services and documentation), the abstract could be revised to reflect this shift.

2. Tables 1 and 2 have the same title -- I believe the title of Table 1 should read: Percent distribution of CS cases by indication, according to CS classification

3. Under "Characteristics and caseloads of the facilities", last sentence, would the authors check that the numbers they are citing are correct for: "an average of 11% (range 0.5%-10.9%) of CS cases at each provincial hospital..." The average seems unlikely given the range.

4. Discussion, 7th paragraph, that begins "Poor quality of care..." -- the authors state that the assessment found low rates of assisted vaginal delivery due to lack of equipment and weak provider skills in applying forceps. What about applying a vacuum extractor? Or is this device not used in Afghanistan?

5. Last sentence before the Conclusions -- the accuracy of the data may vary between facilities but also between providers where there are multiple providers in the same facility.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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