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Reviewer’s report:

Thanks for submitting this manuscript. I believe it is important to synthesize evidence regarding the Maternity service organizational interventions that aim to reduce caesarean section. I have few comments that need to be taken on board.

1. The review included cluster RCTs. Kindly include any methods that were pre specified for dealing with the unit of analysis issues, though none of the cluster RCTs was included in quantitative synthesis. It might be essential for further update of this review.

2. Please explain the pre specified choice of random model for all comparisons. Meta-analysts understand that ’random effects model assumes between-study variability and provides a more conservative estimate of effect, typically resulting in wider confidence intervals”. This is a textbook definition but it does not explain why it was chosen as a default. Please remember to mention that under the random-effects model the goal is not to estimate one true effect, but to estimate the mean of a distribution of effects.

3. It is not clear where did this statement come from "Insufficient numbers of included studies in each of the meta-analyses (< 10 studies) meant that subgroup analyses to examine potential sources of heterogeneity were not possible". This can only be true for investigating publication bias. Further, potential sources of substantial heterogeneity could be investigated by other methods. I am not sure I have seen an effort to explain the substantial heterogeneity in the 5 studies included in the meta-analysis for labor augmentation.

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.

Yes

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:

Acceptable
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