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Paradox lost on the US-Mexico Border: US Latinas and cesarean rates
This is a study using data from the Childbirth Connection's Listening to Mothers III survey, involving a quantitative analysis and a qualitative analysis. The aim of their study was to determine the odds of compounded disadvantage for Latinas having a CS in border compared to non-border hospitals, and to understand women's birth experiences to better understand the Latino paradox.

I have multiple concerns about this paper, namely the quantitative analysis is inadequate and the discussion section needs to be rewritten. In its present form I do not recommend publication of this manuscript. The authors may want to separate the quantitative and qualitative analysis and present them as separate manuscripts.

Quantitative analysis
1. Variables- to determine differences in CS rates, basic medical and pregnancy factors such as maternal age, parity, previous CS, gestational age at delivery, presentation of the fetus, number of fetuses should be included in Table 1. Just including the 5 descriptive statistics does not give the reader an idea about the sample population and their characteristics.
2. Model results- the authors have documented exponentiated coefficients in Table 2, however, they have been used/implied in the results section (page 7, line 10; page 7, line 12) as an odds ratio, which is incorrect. For ease for readers, odds ratios are usually presented. The exponentiated coefficients should be converted into odds ratios and then presented in Table 2, with the description in the Results section changed accordingly.
3. Models 2 and 3- I am confused whether the authors also used logistic regression for these models, bearing in mind that for model 2, the sample size was 52. Or did the authors use univariate analysis? i.e. the authors just looked at the effect of compounded disadvantage on the non-border sample?

Discussion section
1. What are the limitations of the study? What are the strengths of the study?
2. Given that no pregnancy or medical characteristics of the women were considered in the quantitative analysis, the authors asserting that the likelihood of CS is influenced by intersecting identities in particular geographic contexts (page 14, line 1-2) is a large stretch.
3. The discussion section only has one paragraph stating about Intersectional theory and then stating that intersectional theory can explain mode of delivery. As per the 'Submission to Authors' guide for BMC pregnancy and childbirth, the discussion section should "discuss the implications of the findings in context of existing research and highlight limitations of the study."

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.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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