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Author's response to reviews:

We have revised the manuscript according to the reviewers' comments and suggestion as the followings:
1. Add the abstract to the manuscript,
2. Add more explanation on risk and benefit of midline and medio-lateral episiotomy and more references to describe about this in the second paragraph of the discussion part,
3. Sample size adequacy was based on confidence interval of the results.
4. Outcomes evaluation were described more in the second paragraph of the methods part,
5. Proportion of follow up cases to assess the outcome of interest were described in the third and fourth paragraph of the results part,
6. Definition of deep perineal tear and other outcome of interest were described more in the second paragraph of the methods part,
7. Add more update reference no. 4,5,
8. Background part, paragraph 1 line 7, paragraph 1 line 9, paragraph 2 line 10, paragraph 3 line 1-3 had been changed according to the reviewer suggestion,
9. Results part, paragraph 2 line 7, paragraph 3 line 5-6 had been changed according to the reviewer suggestion,
10. Discussion part, paragraph 3 had been adjusted according to the reviewer comment,
11. Reference no.3 had been corrected according to the reviewer notice,
12. Table 1, Apgar score was deleted,
13. Table 2 was deleted and described in paragraph 4 of the results part,
14. Described more about the policy of routine and restricted episiotomy in our setting in the background part (paragraph 2, last sentence "In Srinagarind Hospital, our personnel were encouraged to use restrictive episiotomy and independently selected episiotomy type.")
15. There were patients who had an episiotomy, and there were patients who did not undergo episiotomies due to the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the study. This is not an outcome of interest,
16. Blood loss was estimated based on visual inspection as described in the second paragraph of the methods part according to the reviewer comment.