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**Reviewer’s report:**

1. Abstract is too long the aim of the study must be briefly written as objective not the background.
   line 38. mean time should be presented in the results.
   line 41-44 statistical methods should not be presented in the abstract.
   line 46 p valu should be presented.

2. 111 pg5 the primary outcome and the secondar outcome should be briefly defined. The primary outcome of this study is an expected matter as AI is mostly expecte in patients with OAS#S than only episiotomy. The interesting part of this manuscript is the clasification of the episitomies and OASIS ans the secondary outcome may be the primary outcome.
   3. pg8 line 181-182 significantly more frequent and p=0.05 is it sig nificant or not?
   4. Although it si presented in tables; Double incontinence OR 3.3 is not presented in the results. OR=3.3 and p value 0,07 not significant? may be consider giving only OR or P value

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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