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Reviewer's report:

In the context of the unprecedented and global increase in caesarean section rates, this manuscript present the interesting case of the US border residents to explore if the described Latino paradox holds in the border.

The source of the data is a previously conducted nationally representative survey on-line. My main comments are methodological and for inclusion in the discussion.

* How is the "border region" defined for this analysis/study? In terms of distance from the border? In other words how, at practical level, border-region women defined? Consider adding an explanation in the methods.

* The source of the data is the Childbirth Connection's listening to Mothers III survey. A reference of the survey/methods would be useful for the reader to better understand the methodology of the survey. For example, this was an on-line survey and I wonder what the response rate was and how that affected the representativeness of the sample (of the initial survey in 2011-2012).

* The survey was only completed by "women who could complete the survey in English". This could represent an important bias for a survey that attempts to analyse and draw conclusions on latino women with compounded disadvantage (without private insurance or a college degree). I think this needs to be explained and its limitations included in the Discussion.
Authors explain that the Childbirth Connection's listening to Mothers III survey was followed by a follow-up survey in 2013 (those who responded to the initial survey were re-contacted). Is this follow-up survey part of the same first overall survey or was it an independent survey? About 45% of the women who were re-contacted responded. Do authors have some information about the characteristics of the other 55% who did not respond? Can we assume that the 45% are not a selected particular group? Is it valid to draw conclusions on the basis of the 45%? I think it needs to be included in the discussion.

In my opinion the discussion needs to be strengthened. Strengths and limitation for example are not discussed including some of the points raised above.

For WHO recommendations on caesarean section rates, authors mention in the introduction recommendations from an Statement issued in 1985. However, in April 2015, WHO released a new Statement on Caesarean Section rates and monitoring of caesarean section at facilities. This Statement superseded previous Statement in 1985. References below.


**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 recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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