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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed many of the concerns raised by the reviewer. However, there is still concern about how some of the statistics are reported. In additions there are some areas that need to be clarified and some minor errors that need to be addressed.

1. Page 8, Statistical methods section, 4th sentence: What are quantitative variables? Do you mean interval/ratio or continuous? Was an independent t test used? Also, how was risk ratio calculated for the continuous variables that were compared used a t-test? You should describe how it was calculated. Did you test for normality of the data for the continuous variables? It is rare that length of stay would be normally distributed. If it was tested, what test was used?

2. Page 8, Statistical methods section: Did you conduct post hoc tests? If yes, did you use the Bonferroni correction? From the results displayed in Table 2, it appears you did use post hoc tests.

3. You need to describe how you compared post op complications. for example, did you compare febrile illness yes/no between the pre and post groups? If yes, then why do you not have a p value for comparing "none" between the two groups?

4. How did you compare Hospital days as a categorical variable? If you compare all three categories between the pre and post groups, you get a significant difference, p = .006. To find out where the difference is, you have to do post hoc test between the groups. When you do that, you need to use the Bonferroni correction. From the comparisons, the only one that is statistically significantly different between the groups is 4-7 days vs. >7 days (p = .003). The p values you have reported do not match those that I calculated, so please check your numbers. Also, when you interpret the post hoc test results, you have to say that it means the post group compared to the pre group had significant more mothers with a length of stay >7 compared to having a length of stay of 4-7 days. It does not mean the post group had great length of stay. You should report the more rigorous test of the mean which shows there was not a statistically significant difference in length of stay (p = .87),
5. Page 10, second paragraph says the mean gestational age of the mothers was 38 weeks, then it says the mean was 38.5. Which was it? Also, it should say mean gestational age at delivery was 38.5+/−1.8.

6. Page 12, Results of the secondary outcomes in the mother and newborn: The first sentence should say, There were no maternal death OR readmission, not and readmission. The next sentence should say, .....and the percentage of infants who had weight gain at 6 weeks was similar.

7. In the limitations you state that the study was not powered to address the neonatal outcomes. I suspect is also wasn't powered to find differences in some of the maternal outcomes. This should also be stated.

8. There are numerous spacing errors throughout the manuscript. This may be due to the conversion to a pdf; however, they need to be fixed. It is very distracting.
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