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**Reviewer's report:**

The paper "Appropriateness of elective caesarean deliveries in a perinatal network" is focusing on an important area in modern obstetrics, the rising CS rate without any proven benefit. The paper is a study about the possible impact of including doctors in a retrospective analysis of indications for elective CS as a method of lowering the rate of CS.

Statistical analysis should be: The qualitative variables were compared with a Chi2 statistical test and categorical variables were analysed using the Fisher's exact test. I presume you used the methods like this? MAJOR

Ref 4 should be: http://www.europeristat.com/ MINOR

Fig 1 shows n=26/92 28.3% but in the text (page 6= 26/192? 13.5%) MINOR

The material is too small to really be able to compare possible differences between level I II or III and table 4 could be dismissed. Discretionary

There are different methods to lower the CS rate in cases without medical indications, there will never be zero cases of “maternal request” but if you offer/demand that these women meet expertise in this field before delivery maybe 50% will have a normal delivery. Next problem are doctors deciding for CS on non-medical grounds without maternal request. This is also an important subject that should be addressed in the discussion.

With these changes your paper should be published as a paper showing the importance and need for audit in obstetrics.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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