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Reviewer's report:

General
Overall, good study that complements what is already in the literature supporting the rationale for risk adjustment when comparing hospital performance. Offers another method for doing so, and demonstrating potential change in ranking once this is done

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
None

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
n/a

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
Authors might want to make a stronger case as to how this method improves on existing methods, for risk adjustment especially given that 5/8 conditions could be considered absolute indications for cesarean (e.g. previa, malpresentation, etc).

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions
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