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Reviewer’s report:

Original article because the analysis methods and expected outcomes are usually relevant. Moreover, and I agree with the authors, this article has the great advantage to have better understood by clinicians and therefore better reflected.

BACKGROUND

(Discretionary Revisions)

-I would point sources in the first paragraph:
‘The rate of AUDIPOG network and national perinatal survey in 2010 agreed to show that…’

M&M

(Major Compulsory Revisions)

-I would like to understand what is the specific study design:
• In the study design, is it a retrospective cross sectional study or an historical study which is prospective?
• This study seems exhaustive over a period? If yes, authors should say clearly

- In statistical analysis: authors forgot to describe the descriptive study

(Discretionary Revisions)

-What do authors means by ‘Data abstraction’?

RESULTS

(Discretionary Revisions)

-I found ‘Table 1’ at the end of results after others tables…

(Minor Essential Revisions)

-Have authors collected reasons of maternal convenience? If yes, author should have to describe them.

Table 1 and 2 (Minor Essential Revisions)

-Are the both tables helpful? Maybe, Author should put columns of the number of deliveries in table 2; otherwise table 2 seems not helpful…

Table 3 (Major or Minor Essential Revisions?)
I’m not sure to understand what is the assumption of the only pvalue described in table 3 (0.20): is it to compare the 6 percents? If yes, what is helpful? Comparisons would be preferable 2*2, may be with relative risk of inappropriate rate of CS?

-The description of the 95%IC is more informative than pvalue (I’m agree with authors) but finally it becomes difficult to compare 3 percents together (appropriate or not) according to the level. Describe the RR according to a reference level would allow to have an easier interpretation and to have expected statistic tests.

Table 4 (Major or Minor Essential Revisions?)
-Same remark as above concerning the only pvalue described in table 4 (0.51): Comparisons would be preferable 2*2 (RR), especially if there are too few patients in level 3...

DISCUSSION (Minor Essential Revisions)
-Authors said: ‘the use of expert guidelines may overestimate the real level of appropriateness rate, as physicians using a given medical technique tend to overrate its appropriateness (28)’

May be the authors could detail or argue this idea? Indeed, I thought naively that the use of expert guidelines may overestimate the real level of appropriateness rate, as physicians using a given medical technique tend to overrate its appropriateness’; but the use of expert guidelines may underestimate the real level of appropriateness rate...

REFERENCES (Major Compulsory Revisions)
-Following references are not accurate enough and authors should be more precise about web addresses in particular (ref 3 to 8 and ref 16 to 26, ref 31)
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