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Reviewer's report:

I have read the revised article and the authors have essentially responded to my concerns. It remains a valuable examination of an important question. It also remains a very long piece, but I'll leave that to the editors to judge if that's more feasible in the electronic format.

I would encourage the authors to note in methods and/or limitations why they did not distinguish between primary and repeat cesareans. For their own sake I would encourage the authors to examine the primary cesarean question further (even given the miscoding that might occur) since this distinction has had profound impacts on virtually all analysis I've done on cesarean births -- either in terms of outcomes or decision-making.

Noting that there may be undercoding of epidurals and induction is not the same as explaining what impact these differences might have on their analysis. Are they suggesting the two samples are equivalent and any difference is the result of undercoding? If so they should be explicit about that point and what that means for their findings.