

Reviewer's report

Title: Using a Cesarean Section Classification System based on characteristics of the population as a way of monitoring obstetric practice

Version: 1 **Date:** 7 June 2010

Reviewer: Iracema MP M Calderon

Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?

Yes. This theme is actual and interesting.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

No. The intervention's program isn't detailed on this paper. Although the authors considered the intervention well detailed in the previous publication, I would like to recommend a better description of the intervention's program in this article. This is discretionary revisions.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?

No. It is not clear whether the inclusion of 664 and 628 cases respectively in the first and the second period were representative and sufficient for the results, conclusions, and recommendation for others centers. I recommend that the authors consider the issue about the sample size and discuss it deeper. This is a major compulsory revision.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

No. I suggest the conclusions may be better adequate to objective of the study. This is discretionary revisions.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

No. I suggest the objective of the summary to be replaced by the content of the last sentence of last paragraph of the introduction and thus, the title may be better adequate. This is a major compulsory revision.

7. Is the writing acceptable?

Yes.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests