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Reviewer's report:

To the authors:
My congratulations for this original paper about ECV. Some suggestions.

1. Background: In my opinion, the risk of vaginal breech delivery has not been increasing in the last 10 years. In the last 10 years there has been evidence that vaginal breech delivery is as safe as caesarean delivery without its consequences (PREMODA Study). ACOG, RCOG, SCGO… has guidelines to improve the selection of the patients for vaginal breech delivery. In contrast, in the last 10 years, there has been evidence of the consequences of Term Breech Trial in the rate of vaginal breech delivery. The rise of caesareans in breech delivery is one of the most important reasons for the popularity of ECV.

2. Material and method: Who has performed the questionnaires? Who and How has evaluated the questionnaires? How has evaluated the abdominal muscles tone? And the engagement of the fetal breech? And the palpability of the fetal head? Subjectively? Why have you analysed AFI as categorical variable instead of continuous variable? There is any explanation in discussion. Better in method??

3. Material and method: Which is the p Value to include the variable in multiple regression analysis?

4. Results: In methods you have described two categories of type of breech (frank vs non-frank) but in table 2 are frank vs complete. Please explain.

5. Results: Variables as tonus has three categories but the analysis was performed by merging two of them. Why the merged? The analysis can be made with the three categories.

6. Results: Why “head palpable” was not included in multiple regression analysis?

7. I’m agree with the authors that engagement of the breech is one of the most important predictor (better than the most). But the ECV before 37 weeks is not the solution. The results of Early-ECV increase the success rate but not the caesarean rate, the main objective of ECV. The ECV before 37 weeks may increase the preterm delivery.

8. The main objective of the study is original but the discussion about it is limited. Most of the discussion is about other factors associated to ECV success.

9. Which was the information previous to ECV during pregnancy?
10. Conclusion: I suggest add to the first sentence “in women who undergo to ECV”. The last sentence is not a conclusion of the study data. I suggest conclusions without it. The “engagement of the fetal breech” is one factor associated with the success of ECV. It is not the same that it is a reason of ECV failure. You did not analysed the reason of ECV failure.
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