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Reviewer's report:

The first aim of the study was to investigate presence of adhesions in women during a CS and to compare rates and severeness of adhesions in women with prior CS or no prior CS. The second aim was to investigate maternal and neonatal complications in relation to presence of adhesions.

The manuscript is clearly written and I appreciate the strengths and limitations section part as selection bias is a concern both at recruitment and follow-up.

1) Sample size was based on to detect a difference in the incidence of adhesions. Was any power calculation performed regarding complications? Longer operation times, time to delivery the infant and increased blood loss were reported among women with adhesions, but no difference in other perioperative outcomes or postpartum complications were noted. Could this be attributed to a small sample size?

2) A strength is the prospective design but a major concern is the high rate of lost of follow up 6 weeks postpartum, which the authors also discuss. Any suggestions from the authors to avoid selection bias and higher rates of follow up in this setting?

3) There is a discrepancy between conclusions "The majority of women with a history of CS or abdominal surgery had adhesions and this affected operation time, infant delivery time, and perioperative blood loss, but not other outcomes" However in the result part blood loss in ml (mean) did not differ between women with and without adhesions ( p 0.14). In fact blood loss was only increased in women with severe adhesions. (page 8, ln 57).

4) Page 6. Ln 12. Why do the authors refer adhesions to an independent variable? According to the aim it is the main outcome measure but also a potential mediator to complications.

5) P-values are provided for background data except type and indication of current CS. Either add or not present the p-values at all.
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