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Reviewer's report:

1.0 Major Compulsory Revisions:

1.1 The process of randomization needs more details. How did they ensure a 1:1 ratio of controls and cases? How did they differentiate cases from controls using a delivery registry book which does not usually include all the detailed information about labor and delivery?

1.2 They need to explicitly mention the eligibility criteria and exclusion criteria in this study: Did they include multiple pregnancies, breech etc? A flow chart could be helpful.

1.3 The authors also need to give details on who does labour assessments and decisions; what their experiences and quality of documentation in that hospital. They should also indicate how they carried quality check of their data.

1.4 My advice on study Design: This seems to be analytical cross-sectional rather than case control. They need to analyze and discuss their results accordingly. I do not think there was any randomization in this study.

2.0 Minor Essential Revisions

2.1 Figure 1: This figure is not informative. Proportions should have been better used than absolute numbers for cases. It is unclear what the lines on bar charts represent.

2.2 Table 2: Check some typographic errors that make some of the figures wrong. It is unclear where are primiparous women in this table? Also note some foot note labels are not cited in this table.

2.3 The retrospective nature of the study is a major limitation but it is not discussed
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