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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. In the Methods section, the authors describe that FHR tracing was performed after the attempted version. Was any period of continuous monitoring performed and for how long?

2. Page 7, line 133, the authors stated that both VNRS pain score and successful ECV were considered primary outcomes. Since the sample size was too small to provide significant results regarding successful ECV it should not be listed as a primary outcome.

3. It would be useful to give readers an estimate of how many women in total had a breech presentation during that time period. Additionally it would be useful to know the total numbers who underwent ECV during this time period to address issues of selection bias.

4. The results between the two groups could be comparable due to different operators (either better or worse) rather than the two aids having similar or different affects. The authors need to provide information regarding the operators that performed the ECV and whether there was a different between the groups in term of their experience.

5. How many procedures were stopped due to nonreassuring FHR.

6. Data regarding gravidity in table 1 is of limited value and should be deleted.

7. Please provide the number of women with a transverse lie in both groups?

8. Did the gestational age at the time of the ECV differ between the groups?

9. The results section (page 11, line 207-211) contains issues that belong to the discussion section.

10. Table 2 is very long and crowded with information. Additionally the reader may get lost due to repeated issues. The authors should try to shorten (probably 2 tables instead of 1) and report the bottom line.

11. Explain why 8.3% of the neonates in the powder group had a neonatal admission though all were term neonates.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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