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**Overall comments:**

Inconsistent use of tense. I would recommend an editor for grammatical and structural edits.

Some of the results should be discussion points

1. Title: could be more explicit. This is a focus on cesarean section per maternal request

Introduction: Among pregnant women with uncomplicated pregnancies, the preference for a caesarean section delivery has been increasing in the last decade. This is a literature review, conducted with the aim of exploring the views of relevant stakeholders with respect to the autonomy of women to choose the mode of birth in uncomplicated pregnancies. The authors conducted a literature search to learn about how maternity care providers, pregnant women, and the general public perceive a woman's decision to choose her preferred mode of birth (MOB).

Materials and methods:

2. What was criteria for date selection? Why did you choose 2005 to December 2016?
3. Did you work with a medical librarian/expert librarian to conduct the search?

4. Would add the NICE quality rating to table 1.

5. Why did you limit the key words? Surprised Cesarean on demand, maternal request cesarean were not search options.

6. Did you use references from articles to supplement the search

7. Not clear what were the explicit inclusion criteria for the articles ultimately reviewed

Results: The search identified 48 articles, of which 33 were research studies and 15 were opinion-based articles. Varying levels of support were reported for the right of a woman to make the decision on the mode of birth. Among health professionals, obstetricians were the most supportive of this right. Women reported wanting to choose the mode of birth, with the safety of their babies as the priority. They also rely on the advice of their maternity care provider and considered it the responsibility of their obstetrician to make the decision. A higher proportion of the general public in countries with well-developed private healthcare systems than those with less well-developed ones accept that a woman should have the freedom to choose the mode of birth.

Results

8. Characteristics of the literature on maternity care providers: page 6 line 24-29, I do not understand your sample sizes. Who are "multidisciplinary health care providers"? Is that both doctors and nurses?

9. How did the quantitative studies differ from the qualitative studies. Weren't the quantitative studies based on surveys?

10. Page 7, lines 24-40 was based on trainee responses, but author defaulted to calling them obstetricians which is a little misleading.

11. I suggest an overarching structure to the presentation of the results. Author goes back and forth between quantitative/qualitative studies and different types of providers
12. There are several instances where "discussion type comments" are interspersed in the results section

a. Section on Pregnant women's choice vs obstetricians responsibility; Page 9 lines 9-10, is this your comment or a finding?

b. Section on Is mode of birth an autonomous decision of women; Page 11 line 51-59, it doesn't seem like this is a finding, consider moving to discussion

c. Section on Public opinion; Page 12 line 37-46, consider moving to discussion

Important issues (and international differences) are presented

**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.

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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