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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions

1. The information in the background is like blocks and there is lack of continuity from one paragraph to the next. There is need to rewrite the paragraphs. I suggest that the paragraph “Uterine rupture is a catastrophic…” be rephrased and merged with the information in second paragraph, first line “For every maternal death…” Rephrase and merge the paragraphs “The occurrence of uterine rupture…”, “Uterine rupture stands…”, “In high income countries…” and Other important risk…” as they have related information. Some paragraphs have two sentences, even one sentence. There is need to pull together related information to form good paragraphs.

2. The conclusion is only the magnitude of uterine rupture. There is need as well to relate to the findings of the study. Furthermore, generalization of the findings to whole of Uganda may not be correct due to limitation of the methods used.

Minor essential revision

3. Page 6, The last sentence on the third paragraph “Postpartum haemorrhage, including uterine rupture…” is not clear. Postpartum haemorrhage (PPH) is different from uterine rupture as they occur at different stages of labour. PPH occurs after delivery of the baby but rupture of the uterus commonly occurs during labour and lead to laparotomy.

4. What was the cut off point for parity? Table 2, it is “#5 and #4” which is strange. In the texts of results and discussion is >5. This is also the same for the number of antenatal visits “>4 and <4”, where are those who had 4 visits. There is need to re-visit the data and present accordingly.

5. The OR and its CI in the text of results section is different from that in table 2.

6. In the results, the OR and 95%CI of the parity and distance from the facility are different from table 2.

7. The sentence “The majority of the maternal deaths resulted for hypovolemic shock from haemorrhage and sepsis…[11,33]” should be deleted as these are not in the results section.

8. In the abstract, methods section, it is stated that the controls were randomly selected. In the methods section of the manuscript it states that the controls were three consecutive mothers after the case. Need to be revised.
Discretionary Revision
9. Figure 1 can be deleted as it is completely presented in the text.
10. Table 4 can be deleted; it does not contribute much to interpretation of this paper.
11. Information on the use of the partograph is in table 1 (and not table 2) and that of obstetric fistula is not in any table.
12. The sentence “The 20-34 age range....[15-16, 20,33]” can be deleted as this is a group which majority are giving birth and was not among the risks studied.

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