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Reviewer's report:

1. This paper has improved considerably and many of the concerns that I had with earlier versions of this protocol have been resolved. However, there is still a need for copy-editing, particularly in regard to the use of passive voice, uneven tense (sometimes past tense is used), and the use of prepositions. This is largely to improve writing style but in some cases copy-editing will be essential for clarity, for example the final paragraph on page 3 and the description of the sample size. The description of the study objective also needs to be more clearly worded. Perhaps “evaluate a decision aid to help pregnant women choose mode of delivery”?

2. Unfortunately it is now clear that the authors are proposing a quasi-RCT not a true RCT. Women attending the clinics on different days will be allocated to different arms of the study. It would be preferable for the authors to randomly allocate all eligible women who agree take part in the study to either the intervention or control arms. Allocation should be blinded. The allocation method described in the paper has potential to introduce bias.

3. Currently it is not clear whether the authors intend to report the overall decisional conflict scores. They refer only to reporting three subscales. This needs to be clarified and justified, if the intention is not to report the overall decisional conflict scores.

4. Finally, I suggest that when referring to the reasons that women request caesarean birth that the authors consider describing these somewhat differently, “reasons unrelated to health needs” would be preferable to “unnecessary reasons”. The authors do not know whether the women consider their reasons to be necessary or not. Not all necessary reasons relate to health.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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