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Reviewer’s report:

This study examines if the JCAHO perinatal core indicators were met in a hospital in Italy. The authors state that the JCAHO indicators are a proxy for quality care. The sample size is robust and the authors examined medical records of 1943 women and 1974 newborns born in 2016. The authors are to be commended for their efforts. Suggest a more linear approach to the writing that may be achieved with assistance from an editor.

File 1 is a helpful table.

Line 22: Abstract: Please clarify the aims of this study. Aim 1: to report the frequencies of the five JCAHO perinatal core measures and compare results to xx measures (Healthy People 2020?). Aim 2: To examine differences among variables of participant characteristics for each core measure. Aim 3. To run predictor models…..

Line 25: Abstract: Methods/results. Please provide an overview of the statistics that were used. The reader is led to believe that frequencies will be reported but in the body of the manuscript regression models are used. This is confusing.

Line 28: Sentence "indicators were calculated…." Is unclear

Line 45. A paragraph must be longer than one sentence

Line 68. A paragraph must be longer than one sentence; this sentence is unclear. What do you mean to "assess the adaptability of these quality indicators" ?

Line 88: It is unclear why Healthy People 2010 is being referenced since the 2016 data were analyzed. Suggest comparisons to Healthy People 2020 only

Line 101: paragraph length

Line 104: Frequencies; ; Univariate analysis; Logistic regression models" Please step your reader through your statistical analysis. Frequencies are understood. The regression models are not well delineated. Were regressions run in order to predict outcomes? If so, this needs more clarification and an introduction for the reader.

Line 160: remove the word "substantially"
Line 205-207: Please fix the grammar in this sentence.

Line 220-226: Grammar needs to be addressed. These sentences are unclear.

Line 231-233: please clarify ….suggesting that these conditions may be associated with complications in the intrapartum setting.

Line 234: what is "this practice" referring to?

Line 238: Please cite "one of the main reasons is that cesarean sections receive higher…." While it is clear that c/s get higher reimbursement how do you know for sure that this is the reason providers are performing them? Is this assertion anecdotal or is there evidence to support it? Your data suggest there may be medical complications and factors that lead to increased c/s rates.

Line 242-245: Please make this paragraph more than one sentence and clarify the statements.

Line 246-248: This paragraph is important but does not coherently flow in your discussion. The assertion that c/s is linked to [the lack of] breastfeeding success is in the literature and should be explored more in this paragraph and cited. It is, in this reviewers opinion, a critical reason to avoid c/s when not medically indicated.

Line 249-255: Suggest clarifying grammar in this paragraph and addressing (and citing) evidence-based interventions to increase breastfeeding outcomes.

Line 257: "this practice" - what practice? Please clarify. Please clarify this entire paragraph. Are you saying good prenatal care is associated with better breastfeeding outcomes? Are you suggesting specific educational activities? If so where? In the clinic, community, public, etc.

Line 267: Please clarify this sentence. It is unclear.

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

No

**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.

Unable to assess
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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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