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**Reviewer's report:**

This paper presents a retrospective cohort study to develop and validate an individualized score based on preoperative parameters to predict patient outcomes after vaginal repair of cesarean section diverticulum. The authors conclude that the cesarean section diverticulum score can accurately predict the outcomes of cesarean section diverticulum and can be useful for counseling patients who are making treatment decisions.

Overall the topic addressed should be interest to most readers of BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth and has certain clinical significance. However, I have several concerns about the paper, as given below:

(1) There are many mistakes about the references in the whole manuscript that shouldn't have been made.

For example,

a. reference 1 was misquoted in the first sentence (line 69-70) in the background part. Please select the appropriate literature to support this argument.

b. Reference number appears confused, such as, ref 28, ref 29 (line 75), ref 27 (line 27), ref 23, 30 (line 97), and so on, please re-check them.

c. the sentences in line 87-89 and line 148-149 should add references.

(2) There is something wrong with the common sense of statistics, please consulted the epidemiologists and health statisticians before revised the manuscript.

For example,

a. the C-index is 0.718 in the data and the authors think it can accurately predict the outcomes. I think this conclusion is too confident. As far as I know, the C-index value is between 0.5 and 1. It is no accuracy at all when C-index equal 0.5; 0.50 -0.70 is low accuracy; 0.71-0.90 is medium accuracy, and above 0.9 is high accuracy. 0.718 is only of the lowest medium accuracy.

b. In line 158-159, the authors said patient characteristics and preoperative factors were analyzed using student's t test. Variables are expressed as the medians with ranges. Are the continuous variables normal distribution? If they are normal distribution, they should reported mean and standard deviation; if not, they should not use student's t test.
Other comments:
a. line 118-120 and line 122 and 124 are repeat writing, please deleted one of them.
b. line 203-206 is best done in the methods section.
c. line 214-217 is best done in the statistical analysis section.
d. The myometrium changes with the menstrual cycle, and I want to know whether the time measurement the remaining muscular layer of the participants is uniform?
e. Meanwhile, I also want to know the time measurement the white blood cell and fibrinogen, before or after the surgery?
f. I don't understand the phrase in bracket in line 26, (Canadian Task Force classification II-2), please explain it.

**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.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**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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