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Reviewer's report:

General Comments:

In "Cesarean Deliveries and Maternal Weight Retention," Kapinos et al. report on a retrospective analysis using "propensity score methods" to clarify the relationship between cesarean delivery and postpartum weight gain. This is a revised report reflecting a reasonable address of previous critiques. The background and specific aims of the study have been modified. Overall, the manuscript is very well written and the study methodology is thorough.

Specific Comments:

A. Background

1. The authors provide appropriate background and clarification of their study objective of determining the relationship between cesarean delivery and postpartum weight gain, as well as further explanation as to their use of cesarean deliveries performed for fetal malpresentation in the first delivery.

2. The explanation as to how the findings of the study may "inform provider practices and maternal choices" is sufficient, however, would benefit from further extrapolation, particularly in regards to interventions that could occur post-cesarean delivery. The argument for pre-delivery interventions ("focus on promoting healthier lifestyle and weight habits prior to and during pregnancy") is less convincing as these are already the standard of care.

B. Methods

1. Again, this discussion regarding use of fetal malpresentation and its "conditional randomness" (i.e. association with maternal characteristics such as age, body type, uterine/fetal anomalies) may be more appropriate in the background or discussion sections of the manuscript.
C. Results

1. Reorganization of Table 1 has made it easier to follow and interpret.

2. Tables 2 and 3 would be easier to read if the columns and rows were transposed so that the comparisons and accompanying p-values were read across the columns (as is standard and how the data was presented in Table 1) rather than down each row. This is a stylistic consideration perhaps best left to the editors.

D. Discussion

1. The discussion provides a concise summary of the ways in which this study contributes to the literature and to the controversy regarding the risks of cesarean delivery. The conclusion here that "contribution to maternal weight retention" is NOT a health risk of cesarean delivery is appropriately clarified.
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