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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting study that attempts to address a common issue in the care of women experiencing a caesarean section. This manuscript requires a thorough revision if it is to be published in the English language. Once clarity has been achieved following the revision of meaning, it would require an additional revision to establish if it will contribute new information to the literature.

Abstract

Please refer to women as women rather than puerperas.

Please define what is meant by 'slag' free fluid - this is not a common term used in most countries; clear fluids means free of particulate matter.

Requirement - This paper would require a thorough editorial edit to ensure clarity of writing in the English language given the current choice of words that have been used which may have arisen through translation into English.

Eg: 1st sentence, Line 3-4: but also related to abusive use of no medical indication [1]. This could be more accurately described as 'medically driven caesarean which lacks an evidence base / medical indication for the procedure'

Counter-current mistake inhalation….? Clarity of writing required.

Usual symbol for greater than and/or equal to is ≤ or ≥

Typographical and grammatical errors need to be corrected throughout the document eg. Line 14 - least should be least; Line 16-18 - is not a grammatically correct sentence.

Page 4, Line 1-3. Suggest term fasting conditions rather than fasting projects

The study aim in the abstract appeared to be: This study was to evaluate the impact of different preoperative fasting conditions on puerperas and neonates through a retrospective analysis. In the conclusion of the background, prior to methods, it appeared to focus on outcomes for health of neonates only. Ensure study purpose or aim is consistent and addresses key outcomes.
Under Inclusion Criteria: provide definition of what is meant by 'meeting the indications of caesarean section operation' as protocols may differ across the world depending on setting, services available, skill level of staff, public vs private setting etc

Page 4, Line 5-13 (or 13-24): What is meant by heading 'Objects'. This would be better described as Variable or Data collection.

Pregnant times (P4, Line 9 pregnant times (times)) - is this gestational age?

How did you measure 'huge fetus' - please use standard weight classifications eg macrosomic baby, >4500 grams.

Page 18-19 - sentence does not make sense: To enhance comparability, 18 the puerperas received a uniform anesthetic method (epidural block) was included puerperas [9].

Blood Glucose Level of neonates - check current definition of hypoglycaemia used in most developed countries - appears to be 2.6mmol/L not 2.2 mmol/L as stated in this paper. "However the common thresholds for the diagnosis of hypoglycaemia in the newborn (blood glucose <2.0 mmol/l or <2.6 mmol/l) and hyperglycaemia (blood glucose >10 mmol/l) are at the limits of accuracy for many POC glucose analysers." Australia: https://www.health.qld.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0019/142156/g-hypogly.pdf UK: http://fn.bmj.com/content/102/1/F92

The section on Apgar score can be shortened as this is a world wide scoring system; simply reference Apgar. APGAR Score Leslie V. Simon; Bradley N. Bragg.


Statistical analysis

This study sample of 1599 mothers and newborns was divided into 5 groups for comparison of outcomes. This requires clear statements relating to sample size calculations that were conducted and assumptions made in order to determine power including which variable this was based on; (assume primary outcome of neonatal BSL? or was it maternal BSL?) normal and skewed distributions - which data these referred to; and parametric and nonparametric tests used - as there was a mixture of means and nonparametric data presented.
Results

What is meant by number of labor? Was this numbers of previous labours? How was this calculated - pregnancies - previous elective c/sections.

Some summary statements lack clarity - eg what does: To sum up, the general clinical features of puerperas in each group showed no significant difference and had better comparability. (Please clarify comparability 'with what' or using which variable?)

Results presentation using the Groups A to E were confusing. Table1 - Number of production - meaning is not clear - does this mean number of times pregnant, number of times having C/section, number of births?

Conclusion - check sentence construction for each of the two sentences in the conclusion to make grammatical sense and improve clarity of meaning/

References - some of the references used were very dated eg 2002, 1995. Please reference more contemporary sources (<10 years)

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.

No

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:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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