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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has been improved by the authors. Their rationale for selection of the papers still seems unclear. There is, as the authors also comments, a large number of studies and one could question whether a clear strategy for selection would have strengthened this paper. This could also have been helpful for the reader in evaluating the studies. This probably would mean that some of the papers could have been omitted due to for instance inadequate methodology, small sample sizes and so on. It would further have strengthened the manuscript if the search engine is described in the manuscript and not only in the legend of table 1.

There are still some statements that lack references; for example at page 10, last sentence in the first paragraph. “As far as the pubic symphysis diagnosis is mostly based on deep palpation and the modified Trendelenburg test.” No references are listed.

Under Management the authors says that due to the large heterogeneity of the published studies and the inconsistent quality of the reviewed manuscripts, no strong evidence regarding the utilized methods of treatment is possible. I perfectly agree. However, again it would have strengthened the manuscript if the authors had commented more specifically on methodology and for example the use of different cohorts. Some authors are studying women with severe problems postpartum, while others are following women that are not really treatment seeking.

I still disagree with the authors concerning figure 2, and question the relevance.

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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