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**Reviewer's report:**

Thank you for the opportunity to review this revised manuscript. The authors have made amended the manuscript in response to reviewer feedback, to my satisfaction. There are just some minor issues that remain for me.

**Major Compulsory Revisions:** Nil

**Minor Essential Revisions**

The authors should state the reason why only a proportion of medical records were available for the audit (93.8% pre intervention and 82.1% post intervention)

**Discretionary Revisions**

Abstract and finding (pg 8): the authors state that a "relative change of 12%" in the use of IA was found. This could be more clearly and strongly worded, noting the direction of the change e.g. "a 12% reduction in use of IA was found...". Is this result provide in a table? I could not locate it. If not then perhaps note (result not shown).

End paragraph two of background: stem does not match list. Eg CTG has been shown to....(should read) falsely IDENTIFY fetal distress and... OFFER no benefit...

**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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