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Reviewer's report:

The present study aimed to observe measurable effects on the safety of vacuum extraction deliveries when introducing team training and increased monitoring aimed at vacuum extraction between three different periods. The main finding is the decreased frequency of failed extractions after introduction of clinical team training, and a decreased risk of complicated extraction at the additional introduction of monitoring through traction force measurement.

The paper is easy to read with a clear description of the results. Nevertheless, several data are missing to enhance quality of the paper:

- I don't understand the following indication for one assisted delivery (fetal distress or dystocia, where dystocia included maternal fatigue and prophylactic; large for gestational age 4500g). Is Large for gestational age an indication for assisted delivery? Does the team used a tool to predict fetal macrosomia during labor?

- Please define more precisely fetal dystocia … does it mean lack of progress?

- Please give precisions about types of metallic vacuum which were used in the study

- The program of training is not described enough: Was a simulator used? Who was the teacher? Was the video used during training sessions with feedback?

- In the period 2, there was introduction of an electronical extraction handle which objectively measures and records the magnitude and duration of traction force employed in metal cup extractions. It could interesting to remember in this paper why the authors think that monitoring traction could be beneficial to reduce failed extractions
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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

Yes

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 am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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