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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to Reviewers:

1. Reviewer #1: I found your article very interesting, well organized and easy to read. I only have minor comments you might want to consider:

Response: Thank you for the positive feedback.

Methods section:

2. you refer to the invited participants as "students", this might be confusing, I would suggest to add also "Childless young men and women" for the description of the eligible sample.

Response: Thank you for this comment. We have added a sentence in the beginning of the methods section, to clarify our inclusion criteria.
The goal of the study was to recruit childless women and men between the ages of 18-40 years from different OECD countries.

We did not change the word ‘student’ in the rest of the study recruitment section to childless men and women because the men and women with children or those who were pregnant were excluded afterwards (based on responses they provided).

3. regarding the questionnaires related to "reasons for preferences, attitudes towards birth, learning needs/ knowledge gaps about pregnancy and childbirth". You might want to make clear which were the answers options, and from where were those options taken. Did you determined your options considering qualitative studies for example?

Response: We appreciate your comment and have added more details about the response options for the key variables. See sections highlighted in yellow and an example below.

Students were asked if they would prefer a vaginal birth or Cesarean birth, assuming the pregnancy is low-risk and they could choose the type of birth for their baby. After students marked their preference for either a Cesarean birth or vaginal birth, they were directed to a list of reasons for their choice. These pre-defined response options were based on a thematic analysis of open-ended comments about mode of delivery preferences of 3680 Canadian students who completed the first version of the survey in 2006 [23].

4. Limitation section:

you stated that "Data presented are based on convenience samples from eight countries..." you might want to add "from university students", in order to emphasize the idea that the sample was comprise of well educated people.

Response: We have added ‘ university students’ to the first sentence in the limitations section.
5. please check the format of the references. In some sections you are using the numbers between brackets, and in other sections the numbers are above the line text.

Response: Thank you for noticing inconsistencies with referencing. This has now been fixed. Also, one reference was added (reference 23).

Reviewer #2: The paper brings new data on women's choice for a C section in OECD countries.

Its well written and the methodology is adequate.
Discussion includes the recent literature and main studies in OECD countries.
Limits of the study are stated by authors.
Conclusions are within the range of the results found in the study.

Response: Thank you for the positive feedback.

Additional changes made by authors.

1. We now refer to Spearman’s correlation coefficient as rs. This is the correct statistical notation.

2. We updated reference 40. Previously we referenced it as an unpublished bachelor thesis but were able to locate a web-based report of findings.