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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 both reviewers

   Background has been shortened and restructured.
   Information about health professionals has been deleted as it is not relevant for the aim of this study

   Methodology
   Inclusion and exclusion criteria included
   Statistical measurements included

   Objectives more concretely defined. The main purpose of this work is to assess the trend on the global use of episiotomy in the described population in both types of hospitals after the implementation of a defined health strategy.

   Results:
   Health professional's information deleted. Table 1 (previous draft)
   Table 3 (previous draft) has been transformed in Figures 3 and 4. For better understanding

   Conclusion and discussion sections are now separated.
   Conclusions focused on the results
   Limitations are discussed

   Bibliography has been modified. Also included the recent and updated intrapartum NICE guideline

2. Review

   Modifications as suggested by the editors

   1. Email of all authors have been included
   2. Copyediting. We have tried to improve the style of written English. Manuscript has been reviewed and adapted by the English speaking author
   3. figures have been uploaded as separated files