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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Methods – The analysis of the content scores by Poisson regression does not seem proper.

   Poisson regression is used for outcome measures of “count data.” Count data refers to variables that measure the frequency of the “same” event of interest which occurs within a given population and/or time period. Common examples include the number of individuals developing certain disease within a country during a year duration, the number of tumors identified within an organ, the number of CD4 cells per ml blood in HIV patients, etc. All these variables measure one single event. In the current study, authors evaluate the level that websites support VBAC or ERCS by 14 or 10 different items, and it does not seem appropriate to treat them as the same events and count the numbers.

   A more proper approach is Item Response Theory (IRT) or Latent Trait Model (LTM), both treat the level of support as a latent trait, and use the 14 and the 10 items, each with binary outcomes (either mention or not mention the criterion in the RCOG guideline), as imperfect indicators of the latent trait. Because the authors also are interested in assessing the effects of predictors on supporting level, they may apply the Multiple Indicators Multiple Causes (MIMIC) Model, which allows modeling covariates directly on the latent trait. Authors may consult Mplus (https://www.statmodel.com/) about IRT/MIMIC model, or the software package that they performed analysis upon.

2. Also, please indicate explicitly in Methods section the statistical package and the version that the analysis was performed upon.

3. Main data, Comparison of website clinical data to gold standard, Last paragraph on p. 9 - “... The difference in means was not statistically significant (p = 0.593). ... significantly more likely to support ERCS (p = 0.006). ...” What statistical method was used to evaluate the differences?

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Main data, Quality assessment of top websites, first sentence, “... Figure 2 (Figure 2).” Delete the redundant Figure 2.

2. Main data, Website characteristics as predictor of content scores, p. 10, last sentence, “... on ERCS score (Table 4Table 4).” Delete the redundant Table 4.
Discretionary Revisions

1. Add columns in Table 2 for predictors (country of origin, funding source, authority of source, intended audience) or provide another table showing the distributions of these predictors.
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