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Reviewer's report:

Reducing unnecessary caesarean sections: scoping review of financial and regulatory interventions

This article provides a scoping review of studies that have assessed the effect of financial incentives and related regulatory and legislative factors on C-section rates. Overall, they find that the evidence is inconclusive because of inconsistent effects and low quality evidence. The authors highlight the need for more rigorous studies in order to attain more rigorous evidence.

Overall, the article was very well written. The authors provide a very thorough assessment of the studies that exist on this topic. I appreciate the amount of detail they have provided in tables to highlight the different components of the studies, what they have found, and how they rated the quality of evidence. This is an important topic, so it is crucial to have this type of review to be able to understand what we do and don't know about contributing factors related to financial and regulatory interventions and C-sections. I have limited comments, as I feel that the paper is very thorough in its review and there are very few things for improvement.

Suggestions for revisions:

1) Background: the authors refer to the high rates of C-sections but don't actually present the figures. It would help to show some numbers in the Intro section.

2) Within the Results section, it would be helpful for the authors to add 1-2 sentences per study reviewed to explain the limits of the study. This would be especially useful for studies where the effect is in the opposite direction than expected. In addition, this would also be the place to add what is "weak" about the analysis. The authors mention this in the Discussion under Certainty of Evidence, but when each study is discussed, it would help to know what contributed to the weak evidence or might have caused there to be no effect/effect in opposite direction than expected.
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