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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the revised version of the manuscript. The authors have significantly improved the manuscript by explaining the main objective better and clarifying several issues.

I understand the point that this novel classification of episiotomy practice could be superior to Robson's as it takes into account the mode of delivery (spontaneous, forceps, vacuum). However, in my opinion the authors still should not have omitted the VBAC (multiparous with a nulliparous perineum) or abnormal presentation (OP, synciput presentation, etc.) from the classification. The reason why these are not included should be discussed in the paper.

Regarding the secondary objective, since the results are related to OASI and the effect of episiotomy on OASI, the authors should describe the common practice in the region at that period in order to increase reproducibility of their findings. Use or lack of use of other methods of primary prevention of childbirth trauma (manual perineal protection, perineal massage, warm packs, birthing position) and diagnostics of OASI (is bidigital rectal examination performed after each episiotomy as is recommended? Or ultrasound of the sphincter?) should be described.

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