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Author's response to reviews: see over
Cover letter

This work is part of a wider evaluation on maternity health care policy making. We show the results of a series of actions made to improve normal birth care in a region of Spain, through measuring one of the most frequent obstetric interventions: episiotomy and the potential harm/benefit when it is not performed routinely: severe perineal damage

1. Review
Modifications as suggested by reviewers

REVIEWER 1 (H Lindgren)

Abstract:
Background has been shortened and restructured.
Methods: Design, settings and inclusion criteria are included in this section (line 40-41)
Data collection is described (line 44)
Results have been shortened (line 54-62)
Results OR and CI included (line 58-62). wording has also been changed and the term prevent and protect have been substituted
Objectives
Objectives more concretely defined (line 131-134)

Manuscript:
Information about parity was not available in this data set, that why we can not use this information to adjust data. We considered this work to know the trend of episiotomy use in women giving birth a single fetus without instrument or C-section between 37 up to 42 weeks of gestation. For this reason we do not analyse episiotomy use in instrumental births. This proportion is shown in a previous paper (reference 22) cited in this manuscript (line 125)

Results:
Is has been created a separated section for results (line 179).
Table I in previous draft, regarding health staff has been deleted. Not relevant for this work.
Table 3. (previous draft) has been deleted and relevant results have been included in Figure 3 and figure 4.
Conclusions
It has been created a new conclusions section (line 216) including the main conclusions of this study
Discussion
It has been created a discussion section.
The main purpose of this study is to investigate the global incidence of episiotomy and occurrence of severe perineal damage in three time points in two types of hospitals. Discussion focus in this issue and limitations are assumed in limitations
section (line 300). And national and international recommended global standards are referred (line 135)
Recommendations made for further research is based in this limitations as already identified and pointed by reviewer (line 311)

REVIEWER 2 ( V Andrews)

Methods: All statistical methods have been included, added one more method (line 169)
Results:
Table I and 3 have been deleted. Included Figure 3 and 4 intended to simplify results section
Explanations of results have been simplified ( line 180-214)
Conclusion section: shortened and focused on main results (line 217-219)

General Suggestions
Language corrections made by Joana White (UK English)
References modifications
Updated reference nº 13 (line 378)