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Reviewer's report:

This study is a population-based case-control study in which all deliveries of children born in Norway during 1999-2015 in breech presentation at term (37-42 week), as singletons without congenital anomalies were eligible. The main aim was to explore if deviation from Norwegian guidelines was more common in breech deliveries associated with intrapartum or neonatal death than in breech deliveries where the infant survived. They also wanted to assess if death might have been prevented if the child had been delivered by planned CD, and whether suboptimal clinical management was more common in breech deliveries where the offspring died than deliveries where the offspring survived.

In my opinion, the article is well designed and accurately described. I would draw the authors' attention on some minor criticisms:

In the first paragraph of page 10, in which independent deaths are explained, the number of deaths in uncomplicated CD group should be mentioned "two" since although the further death was mainly due to poor antenatal care, ultimately the delivery method was cesarean section.

According to the aim and method of this study, it is better to mention the delivery method on page 11 of line 51 in parenthesis instead of gender.

It is suggested that in line 38 of page 12 the word "response to" replace with the word "management of"

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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