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Editor's comments and response- II
Thanks for revising the paper. Most requests for revision have been addressed appropriately. The following requests still need to be addressed before the paper can undergo peer-review:

*1 It is still not sufficiently clear whether matching has been done. Please replace "A case control study was conducted" by "An unmatched case control study was conducted", if that is correct.

Response: Accepted. Yes, that is what we mean. Correction is made in all sections od the manuscript.

*2 The description of the modelling strategy is still not sufficiently clear. "All the variables tested in the bivariable analyses were also included in the multivariable analysis" - I understand that this means independent variables did not have to be significantly associated with the dependent variable to be included in the multivariable models". But how was it then decided which variables to maintain in the multivariable model - which condition(s) did they have to fulfil? In other words - how was the final multivariable model identified? Or did you keep all independent variables in the final model, even the insignificant ones (and if so, why)?

Response: Yes, that is. We prefer to include all the variables in the multivariable model after we did back and forth check. As a result, we found that some variables like pelvic status in Table 1 and parity in Table 2 showed significant association in the multivariable model but was not in the bivariate model. The second reason is that it will make the observed association in the multivariate analysis more creditable as the number of independent variables increase.

*3 The sentence "Logistic regression that does not include number 1 in the 95% CI or P.value < 0.05 was considered as statistically significant" is not correct. It presumably means "Associations were considered statistically significant if the 95% confidence interval of the odds ratio did not include the null value (i.e. 1)". If you wish to refer to a p-value, you need to specify which statistical test has produced it.

Response: Accepted and now corrected.