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Reviewer's report:

This is a very well written manuscript. I have no comments on the presentation of the study. Very well done. The design is straightforward, well analyzed, and appropriately presented. The study is somewhat dated given the current state of the art of managing hypotension and spinal anesthesia. However, I think the data from the study are useful presented in the appropriate perspective. My comments and suggestions are as follows:

* There used to be a major focus on trying to increase intravascular volume (leg wrapping/fluid loading/colloids/etc.) to prevent hypotension because there was an association between more hypotension, more ephedrine use, and more fetal acidosis. When it was determined that ephedrine was the significant cause of the acidosis, then the focus switched to studying the optimal use of phenylephrine. I assume the use of ephedrine in this study was due to lack of availability of phenylephrine or another alpha agonist. That needs to be discussed.

* Since hypotension that is appropriately reversed pharmacologically is not much of an issue for the fetus or mother, the usefulness of leg raising needs to be put in proper perspective. Possible points of discussion:
  
  o Low resource settings where ephedrine is the only available pressor.

  o Rescue from profound hypotension after induction. For example, if the pressure falls rapidly, reversing with pressors AND leg raising.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**

If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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