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Reviewer’s report:

Major compulsory revision
The author has adequately addressed all my prior comments except for the first comment, pertaining to querying why caesarean sections of twin 2 was excluded from the outcome data. If the main outcome is caesarean section (page 7, line 139), for the population of women having either a spontaneous labour or an induction of labour, these births with the outcome (ie caesarean section) should be included in the population for analysis, or at the least, be mentioned in the descriptive tables.

Although caesarean section delivery of the second twin after vaginal delivery of the first twin is usually performed for malpresentation or fetal distress, there may be an association of an increase in these episodes for women having an IOL or spontaneous labour.

I am also unsure as to the meaning of the second paragraph in the author response: ‘The risk estimates with these cases….’ I presume the author means that if these cases of caesarean are included in the analysis, the risk estimates are increased?

Minor essential revision
2. Page 5, line 101. the author used 'with' rather than 'by' ie the line should read 'caesarean section rate in twin deliveries increased by 10%'. Author to clarify the meaning of this sentence.
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